

Wm B. 4078. 3d
none 659

42/-

SOME
IMPARTIAL REFLECTIONS
ON
D. Manby's Considerations, &c.
AND,
Mr. KING'S Answer.

In a Letter to a Friend.

By J. Boyce

1. Cor. c. i. v. 12, 13. *Every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ: Is Christ divided?*

Rom. 14. 4. *Who art thou that judgest another mans servant. To his own Master he stands or falls; yea, he shall be holden up, for God is able to make him stand.*

3 Ep. Joh. 9, 10. *But Diotrephes who loveth to have the preeminence among them, receives us not, ——— Neither doth he himself receive the Brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the Church.*

DUBLIN,

1697

TO THE

EMPIRICAL MEDICATIONS

D. MINDS' Considerations, &c.

AND

MR. KING'S Answer.

1777

I am
of
Cephalic
another man
to his own
to make him
But Discrepancies who leads to have
the present among them
I have done the best
is better than a will, and casts them out of
the Church.

1777

TO THE READER.

THO V wilt find the worthy Author of this ensuing Tract, opposing two persons of a very different Character. M: M. whose scruples are so mean, and so often answered; that as they could have little influence in his Change, so they deserved no new Consideration. The most material of his Questions may be reduced to this, Being that the Church of Rome by her usurping Shifts propagated her Apostacy to her neighbour Churches how can any of those belong to the Catholick Church if they cease that Apostacy, and regain their former state? The answer is easie unl s. infection do for ever subject a Church to that Church which infected it. Can any man doubt whether the British Churches had equal authority to reform themselves for Christ's sake as they had to admit these corruptions for the Popes sake.

The other Person is M: K: who hath needlessly yea to the apparent damage of his cause, bitterly censured the whole body of Nonconformists. Whether his novel notions, or the unseasonable publication of matters of debates among us, be most culpable, it's hard determining; The sad consequences were so obvious, that great importunity sail'd to incline my undertaking our vindication, though the charge against us is great, and the proof attempted from mistaken principles.

But seeing the Author with others judg'd a reply needful, and represented our silence as turned to our reproach; I am perswaded to preface the ensuing Book, wherein thou wilt find both evidence and candor. I shall only hint at what the Book is concerned in, and insist on some Criminations the Author overlooks.

Mr: K's. excluding us from the Catholick Church can harm us little when he gives us a discription of this Church so entirely Popish, and opposite to the joynt testimony of Protestants, S. 68: of the in a controversy betwixt the Romanists and us. The Ar- Church. ticles of the Church of Ireland define the Catholick Church

To the Reader.

4. Bell: de Eccl: in the Creed, to be the invisible body of Elected Saints milit: lib: 3: in heaven and earth. But all of M: K's. description, is Cap: 2. Bellarmine's own who strangely confounds a particular

Church with the Catholick Church visible, out of which particular Churches are formed, unless you admit Infidels for Members and into which they are resolved; unless they cease to be Catholick Members when their Pastors dy or remove. Whereas M: K. might have known that the Catholick visible Church as entitive is made up of professing Christians, and particular Churches are but secondary members of this body as Organical by Aggregation.

But the Dissenters will deny his charge by further proving that they are subjects to their lawfull Pastors, that such are not their Pastors whom he chargeth them with separation from; And they can justify their Separation to be a duty, and so no bar to their Catholick priviledg if they had some times been subject to such. Tea it's manifest, the Church of England account us within the Pale of the Church by her calling us Brethren departed in the Faith when dead, and too oft Excommunicating us when alive. His charge of Ecclesiastical Rebellion cannot yet affect us, when we think that we justly deny the Convocation to be a fit Representative of all the Pastors in England; and not a supreme power over all our Churches, yea and suspect a definition of the Catholick Church by such regent Officers as what favours the Universal Headship, and may well end in the Pope as principium unitatis.

His positiveness in our duty to be silent when suspended, without regard to justice of the ground of it, imports he hath forgotten that Casuists generally determin, that an unjust sentence bindes not before God or the Church; and that Pastors power in the church is not of the same extent as a Kings in the State, but under the limits of many more instituted laws. But these matters being debated in the book I proceed.

M: K's Sarcasm against our cant from M: M's. allusion to a plain scripture p. 13 may call him to suspect what spirit himself is of (Luke 9, 55.) and others of his sort who ridicule scripture passages though used in the sence of the spirit that inspired the writers of the scriptures and condemn in us those principles which were the common sence of Protestant Bishops, but yet these must be the only Protestant Successors, because they keep up the ceremonies tho they despise many important doctrines which they more valued themselves by.

To the Reader.

Reader, thou maist wonder how M: K. that affirmeth no ministers may reform no nor preach against the Establishd Church, can publish these thoughts of his so repugnant to the sence of the Church, and undertake to reform the verry Catholick Church by a definition of it so opposite to that his Church hath published.

He Reproacheth us with the favours we new recieve from men of M: M's perswasion. We thankfully own the Kings Favours without ungrateful enquiries into the grounds of it, nor yet doubting but we shall take care not to forfeit what he thinks meet to grant: But why should you that dislike an Inquisition grudge us a little ease? I believe you are not for blaming the Magistrate when the Rods and Axes are disused. Are not the miseries great enough which we have endured at your hands for refusing to sin in doing things which you had nothing but the bare authority of the imposer to plead for; But I heartily wish all our hardships so forgotten by us as that they neither abate charity nor prevent union on Christian Catholick terms.

M: K. P: 39.

Reply: 10

I confess it's no small amazement to hear the Prelatists reflect on the present liberty of Dissenters. Are we blameable for meeting now we do it with safety when we suffered so much rather than forbear it? Can they that have refused Preferments endured prisons, reproach and loss of estates for their principles be suspected apt to renounce or betray them for a smile?

How can these men that y^e other day resolved all law into the Kings meer will, now brand our meetings as unlawful? But this will convince the world that that party will allways Skrew up the point of Loyalty whose Interest the Government promotes, and yet may challenge their own sentiments when the Throne is less auspicious.

Finally why will these persons thus clamor as if they bewailed they had lost an opportunity to inflict the same evils by the interposal of a power we might well have expected less kindness from? Have we any thing but immunity from punishment? Do we enjoy your preferments or places? Is it no favour you reap whilst you enjoy your Revenues, and publick opportunities of service? you will esteem it so, and more pitty others, if ever you come to endure the penury, hazard and contempt of other faithful Ministers; which tho I suggest in order to a more sober judgment. yet I desire never to behold.

To the Reader.

M. K. p. 72.

M. K. Brands us as friends to the Popish Party.

Reply.

Through the weakness of the Clergy this silly reproach is propagated among the people the falsehood wherof time may discover more than a present flash of heat for low interests can do.

But wherein lyeth this friendship unless that you will not suffer us to be friends with you, and therefore you conclude we must needs be one with them; I heartily wish all could acquit themselves of culpable friendship with them as we can. I am sure we agree not in principles with them in any thing wherein we differ from you, and we blame you for nothing but wherein you agree with them. Let us reform your Church and We promise we will remove nothing but what is Popish; Let them reform your Church and i'll engage they'll take away nothing but what is Presbyterian. Do you condemn us for any thing but that which Popery would relieve us in; is it we that bow to the East, and to the Altar? do we use vain pageantry in Consecrating of Churches and utensils baptiseing them with saints names. Do we frisk from place to place in reading our Service, use the sign of the Cross, kneel at the Sacrament which never obtained in the Church before Transubstantiation. Have we Absolution of sins to the uncensured? Is private Communion our manner? Have we Organs, Singing boys, unscriptural Confirmation, preaching Deacons, Reading over the Dead, Holy days, Surplices, Responsa's and twenty more appendants to worship. The *Romish Church* hath all these; whereas we worship God without all this stuff added to *Gospel institutions*, and are content with that that for decency the contrary wherto is indecent by natural light or common usage.

Further whether most countenanceth the universal Headship your Diocesans or our plain Presbyter? Have we *Deans* and *Chapters*? *Chancellors of Bishops Courts* the prime managers of Discipline, Pluralities &c.

What common interest can we have with them unless as subjects to the same King & how little some of the N. Conformists befriended their interest these very men lately reproach us with, and its Christian and Generous in his Majesty to overlook.

Few considering men will think that we who have endured so much under you for dislike to the remains of Popery, will espouse that

To the Reader.

that Church Form where we must meet with all your faults and much greater nor is it probable we should do any thing unbecoming sincere and discerning Protestants though we profess due Loyalty both from Conscience and from Grateful Resentments.

What then can be the matter, that whiles the *Hind* commends you as next of kin, your worship practices, Constitutions, yea Doctrines of late do so exceed in Harmony with the Popish party above Us, while Mr. *M.* tells you their Flowers are your ornament, yea the world knoweth they love most of you & your wayes better than us, and many of your own proclaim, they would be *Papists* rather than *Presbyterians*; that yet we must still in talk, Sermons and Print, have this character of great friendship fastned on us. It seemeth to have its rise from this, you had cast us out of all places, and possessed them yourselves, whereby you apprehend us now less envied, and so less exposed to the first attack of Covetousness or ambition in your rivals; but is it fair in you, first to set us below envy, and then fret that we are not made a sacrifice to preserve your grandure.

I shall conclude these remarks I have made on M. *K's* unreasonable provocations, with my hearty prayers to God that he would discover to the Church of *England*, and to us whatever our mistakes have been, that by his present dealings, he would dispose us to true repentance for our foolish as well as sinful heats, and our valuing any interest above Christ; and that he would give all a more truly Catholick spirit, which will be found the serviceable as well as Christian temper; and is so needful to revive the bleeding interest of Religion among us. That I may contribute my mite to this, and the peace, which would result therefrom, permit me to hint.

1. The terms imposed on the Nonconformists were amazingly severe, and certain to make the number of the scrupulous considerable.

No Church under heaven, except the popish, ever imposed assent and Consent to so many disputable things. We must solemnly assent to many Doctrines we cannot own, and to many

practices.

To the Reader.

practices which we always scrupled, and much more their revival after they were once removed. We must be reordained, we must solemnly declare the covenant bound no man, when as a vow it must bind to all that was lawful in it, and we know some who were *sui juris* when they took it. we must swear never to endeavour alteration in the Church as established, whereas it owns in its preface to the curses in the *Liturgy* that its Discipline is defective, and we believe the same of many other things, to say nothing of the many disorders apparent in it.

The *Presbyterians* on the Kings return proposed to use the *Liturgy* with some amendments, and to submit to the Model of Episcopacy, drawn up by the peaceable Bishop *Osser*; but availed not.

2. The Consequences of the divisions produced by these severe terms, have been dismal, how much of mens Ministry hath been wasted on these matters, which might have been employed to more edifying purposes? the prophane have had an engine to exert their inbred enmity against the serious, was it not come to that pass, that one was jeered as a *Phanatick*, if he dared not to be prophane. Yea under the shadow of zeal against *Nonconformists*, men became light in their gravest employs, Heterodox in their notions, and too many did ridicule all Religion in the most probable evidences of it as *Cant* and *Hypocrisy*, what need I enlarge any more. Were the things contended, for by the imposer valuable, so as to countervail the least of these mischiefs?

3. It is necessary for Church and State, that the union of Ministers and communion of Sts. be provided for on more comprehensive terms.

All our study and prayers backed with holy hardships, have not, nor ever can bring us to comply with these; the Churches strongest arguments for them, be that they are indifferent and surely the Churches necessity will at last convince her that a poor Plea; Religion must decay, and the strength of the Church will abate, whilst the number of Dissenters is so great. Gross errors will prevail much while Dissenter is the common odious name of all; and bad men will influence, when the terms

To the Reader.

terms of union are so hard, as to exclude the good. Let the terms of peace be once such that wise and good men need not scruple, and separation will grow so odious a name as will expose the guilty, were the tolerable entertain'd, how would love flourish, and a l be usefull to the Churches real interest, shall we then provoke God to desert us by our quarrels, and loose the very name of *Protestant*, by contending for things that are of no use to us either as protestants or Christians.

The Kingdoms interest concurr's as an argument to it, where could be the policy of cutting off so considerable a part of the nation from servicableness to the state, because they could not agree to some formes which had no influence to make them good Christians or good Subjects, strange was the impression of the Clergy (or some others) that the fittest man must not serve the State, if he scrupled the Cross in Baptism, tho I am no Errastian, yet I cannot but perswade the Magistrate not to interrupt trade, harrase his Subjects, keep his Treasures empty, give his enemies the advantage of a discontented party, tempt them to irregularities and dislikes of his Government; and all this for some Oathes and Ceremonies valluable only as the outworks of excessive grandure, ore distinguishing mark between them that fear an Oath, and them that fear it too little.

May not we expect the Government to say in due time, it can be no sin against God, to take away those things which the lovers of them call indifferent, and therefore cannot quarrel against the removall of, nor seperate if they be removed; it is not our interest to keep out so great a body of Dissenters, whose compliance it is vain to expect when they suffered so many years, testifying against them as sinful. Let therefore the peace of the Church, and prosperity of the State be provided for by things of more moment, and less disputable.

4. The terms that would be comprehensive of the most considerable part of Dissenters, are neither difficult nor dangerous.

It was not peaceable or prudent Suggestion, that every little change is fatal tho mens interest, do not tempt them to make it so. Must the body die, if the hair or nails be par'd, I will not dare

To the Reader:

to make proposals so unseasonably; But I think it easy to demonstrate that no greater a change is needful than will consist with decency in worship, restraint of fundamental errors, the Churches peace and truest glory, the Magistrates tranquil security and the just credit and power of the Clergy.

Its our temper or selfish respects, not our differences, which have kept us so long asunder. Could we but stoop less than our Lord's example calls us to, when he wash'd his Disciples feet, the debates would soon be at an end. Were we weaned from the love of Dominion, which he expressly forbids, and inspired with that love he declares so essential to his followers, it were impossible for us to unchurch each other, who can subscribe all the Articles of the Church of *Ireland*, and all the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of *England*, as we can and will do.

I might hope a little prudence (which God seems about to furnish us all with) could not fail to make us one; in the mean while, & as fit means conducive to it, let us attend to our more needful work, valuing each others as Christian societies, tho under some pardonable mistakes.

That God would shew all of us the pattern of his house, and establish us in his truth, is the prayer of him who longeth to see peace within the gates of *Zion*, owneth all for Catholick members who are baptized visible Christians, tho fixed in no particular Church, and so not subject to any stated Pastors; blesteth God for our reformation, tho instruments might be culpable; acknowledgeth all Christian societies to be Churches, where the Word is truly preached, and Sacraments administred by duly qualified Pastors, tho a Canonical right be disputable, so that no contradictory thing be added which dissolves their Church-state, and dare not exclude from the Catholick Church forreign Protestants, who reformed by God's word, tho without the consent of the major part of a corrupt Clergy: yea, will not stake the Reformation in our Lands on a casting Vote in the *Convocation*, but its correspondency to Christ's rules, who alone is supreme Ruler in his house; and by whose laws the fidelity of his Stewards, and their actions is determined.

S I R,

SIR,

I Have according to your desire perus'd *J. D. Mawby's* Considerations, and Mr. *King's* Answer, and shall here give you my thoughts of them.

For the *D's* Considerations, I never imagined the Protestant Cause in any danger by so weak an Assault. If these be the strongest reasons he has to produce, he seems to be as yet but a *Novice* in the Roman School, and arriv'd no higher than the young fry of *Missionarys* whom the *Fathers* furnish with such Questions as these to accost ignorant people with. There is nothing in that Paper but what more learned Champions for the Church of *Rome* have more plausibly urg'd, and our Protestant Divines both at home and abroad as solidly refuted. So that it seem'd to me a needless expence of time to repeat the Answers so often given to those Questions, because Mr. *M.* was pleas'd to ask them over again. And I should have been still of that mind, if Mr. *K's* Answer had not alter'd my thoughts. 'Tis indeed judicious and clear enough wherever he defends the Church of *England* upon those principles which are common to her with other Reformed Churches; but where his narrow affection to a Party has byast his judgment, he has unhappily founded the justice of the Reformation on such principles as are only calculated for the vindication of the Church of *England*, and (what is much worse) such as cast disingenuous Reflections upon the rest of the Reformed Churches. I shall therefore in these *Remarks* suggest such truly *Catholick Principles* as justify all the Reformed Churches both as to their Reformation, and their claim to be a true part of the *Catholick Church*; which, if I mistake not, Mr. *K's* as well as Mr. *M's* Paper would exclude some of them from; for the *Notions* of the one as well as the other turn the *Catholick Church* into a *Seet*, and are injurious to Christian Charity in its due extent, tho not both in an equal degree. And I undertake this the more willingly, because 'tis truly *Catholick principles* must preserve the all of it.

ons of Protestants, and dispose them to as near an union in practice as can be expected under the unavoidable differences of our Judgment about matters of less importance. And in pursuance of this design, I shall follow the order of Mr. K's Answer, who puts D. M's Paper into all the method 'tis capable of, and only take notice of those Answers wherein Mr. K's either Judgment or Charity seems to fail him.

The 1st. Quest: proposed by D. M. in his Preface is,

What is meant by the Catholick Church?

Mr. K's Answer is, *'Tis the whole body of men professing the Religion of Christ, and living under their lawful spiritual Governors,* p. 4.

There is no doubt he intends this for the description of the Catholick Church here on earth, as measured by a judgment of charity, and comprising all credible professors of the Christian Religion. Here are two characters to distinguish the Members of it, *Professing the Religion of Christ, and Living under lawful spiritual Governors.*

Now that which I chiefly dislike in this description is, that this latter mark of the Catholick Church [*Living under lawful spiritual Governors*] gives us a Notion of it not only very obscure, but too narrow. Nor does he find any such mark assign'd either in that Text he quotes, 4 Eph. 3, 4, 5. or in that passage he cites out of St. Augustin. And 'tis the more necessary to insist on this, because every Notion of the Catholick Church, which is too narrow, is so far *schismatical*; for it cuts off those from their relation to the Catholick Church who are members of it, and Mr. K. himself does afterwards apply it to that ill purpose.

That this Notion of the Catholick Church is too narrow (on supposition Mr. K. mean no better than he speaks) is hence evident, because there are many who are true members of the Catholick Church who live under no Pastors or spiritual Governors at all, nor indeed have the opportunity to do so. What does he think of many Christians that live in some forreign Plantations where they are not furnish'd with them. Nay, to propose an Instance much more considerable. What does Mr. K. think

think of all the Protestants who are yet in *France*, and because they will not change their Religion, are confin'd to Gallies, Prisons, or Convents? Are all these, by the banishment of their Ministers, excluded from the *Catholick Church*? Has the *French King's Edict* so malignant an influence as to cut them off from the body of Christ, by depriving them of their lawful Pastors? If so, Popish Princes have a very formidable power, and Protestants may well dread their *Edicts* upon a *Spiritual* as well as *Temporal* account more than all the *Thunders* of the *Vatican*.

But I fear Mr. K. would scarce allow the Reformed Churches in *France* to be any part of the *Catholick Church* if they had their Pastors again: if we compare this description of it with other passages in his Answer. For this description is very *obscure*; and, if I conjecture right, Mr. K's Notion of lawful spiritual Governors much more *narrow*.

What does he mean by *Lawful Spiritual Governors*? Are they to be estimated such by the *Law of the Land*, or by the *Laws of the Church*, or by the *Law of Christ*?

Does he mean such spiritual Governors as are established in every Nation by the *Authority of the Civil Magistrate*? If so, then the *Arrian Bishops* when established by the Emperors of their opinion were the only lawful Pastors, and all that part of the people that adher'd to their Orthodox Pastors cease to be members of the *Catholick Church*. Then the *Popish Clergy* in *France* are the only lawful *Spiritual Governors*, and the Protestants there are no part of the *Catholick Church*; because they separate from them. And shou'd the *Popish Clergy* be established in these Kingdoms by Law, all that shou'd adhere to their Protestant Pastors (even those whom Mr. K. now thinks their only lawful ones) wou'd cease to be members of the body of Christ. So that the supreme Magistrate might make Pastors lawful or unlawful at his pleasure, and make those that are this month members of the *Catholick Church* cease to be so the next. But this is a Principle I wou'd hope fitter for Mr. *Hobbs* than for Mr. K. to defend.

Is it then the *Laws of the Church* that must determine who

are the *lawful* Pastors? If this be his Notion of them (as his following discourse wou'd incline one to think); What *Church* does he mean, whose Laws must determine this great debate? If the *Universal Church*? I know none can make Laws to oblige all the members of it but Christ himself, whom Mr. *K.* grants to be the *only* Head of it, p. 55. And how shou'd we know the sense of the universal Church in this matter, when there has been no *General Council* these many hundred years, nay when there never was any such thing at all. The largest *Councils* that Church-History records, being summon'd by the *Roman Emperors*, whose *Mandates* cou'd not reach the *extra-Imperial Churches*. What is this Church then whose Laws or Judgment must determine who are lawful Pastors? Is it every *National Church*? If so, 'tis a difficult matter to know what that is. For unless Mr. *K.* wou'd give such a schismatical Notion of it, as the Papists give of the Catholick Church, it must include all the particular Christians and particular Societies of such within the bounds of that Nation, who profess the true Christian Religion in all its essentials, (for all true Churches do not profess it in equal purity). Such a National Church is not of divine Institution, and is indeed only a combination of Churches as united under one Civil Sovereign. Its true Notion lyes not in any combination purely Ecclesiastical and Intrinsecal, but Civil and Extrinsecal. As the true *National Church of England* (unless we will confine the name to a Sect or Party) denotes all the Churches in *England* as united under one *King* that has a civil Supremacy over them. But what if in the same Nation there be a division about some disputable Doctrine as betwixt *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* in the dominions of several *German Princes*, or about Church-Government and modes of Worship, &c. as in these Nations? What if the several particular Churches according to these differences in their judgment fix under different Pastors? Who are the *Church* whose Laws must decide this debate about lawful Pastors? Is it such an Assembly of the Clergy as our *Convocation*? But what if both Parties have such Assemblys? Is it that Party of the Clergy which the Civil Magistrate does establish and not the other,

other, then the Civil Magistrate may in *Germany* make both the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* lawful Pastors, and here both the *Conformists* and the *Nonconformists*, nay and ~~name~~ make them at his pleasure, and so make their Churches a part or no part of the Catholick Church. Nay, if this be true, then in *France* the general Assembly of the Popish Clergy must determine who are lawful Pastors, and were the Protestant Ministers there now, for the people to adhere to them wou'd not only be unlawful, but (what is worse) such a *Sin* as would cut them off from the Catholick Church. And does Mr. K. really think so? What, wou'd they cease to be the subjects of Christ because they prefer those Pastors who teach his Doctrine, and administer his Sacraments, and discipline according to the Rules of the Gospel, before those who grossly corrupt them, and impose those corruptions? He must have a very odd understanding that can assent to so senseless, not to say so wicked, an assertion: For this were no better than to set up a point of meer human Order in opposition to the interest of Truth and Holiness. I might here instance again in the *Arrian* Bishops, who had not only the countenance of the Emperors, but got Imperial Councils (call'd General, as that of *Armini* and *Syrmium*) on their side; and according to this Principle, they were the only lawful Pastors, and those that separated from them were no part of the Catholick Church.

I know not how Mr. K. will like these consequences; But he cannot avoid them, unless he will say, That where there are in a Nation two divided parties of Christians fixt under different Pastors, those are the only lawful Pastors who are on the side of Truth in the Points controverted betwixt them, whether they have the Civil Magistrates countenance or no. And if he say this, 'twill follow on the other hand, that in those Popish Kingdoms where there are any Protestant Ministers, they are the only lawful Pastors, and the Popish Churches that live not under them no part of the Catholick Church. Nay, in those parts of *Germany* where there are *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*, if the *Calvinists* be in the right, the *Lutherans* for separating from the *Calvinist* Ministers, forfeit all relation to the Catholick Church.

Church. And to add no more, if the *Non-Conformists* be in the right in the matters debated betwixt them and the *Conformists* about Church-Government, &c. they are the only lawful Pastors, and the *Prelatical Churches* no part of the *Catholick Church*.

Or lastly, Must the *Laws of Christ* determine who are lawful Pastors? then those are the only lawful spiritual Governors in his *Church* whose *Office* he has instituted, who have all the *Qualifications* requir'd, 1 *Tim.* 3. ch. 1 *Tit.* Who are ordain'd to their *Office* by such as he has entrusted the power of *Ordination* to, (where such *Ordination* can be had) and who have the *consent* of that *Flock* they take the oversight of. If these be the laws of *Christ* (as it were easy to prove if that were deny'd) then all *Diocesan Prelates* must be cashier'd from the number of lawful Pastors, unless they can prove their *Office* instituted by *Christ*, and so must all the *Parish-Ministers* who want the *Qualifications* mention'd, 1 *Tim.* 3: or who are impos'd on the people without their consent, nay, too often against it. And if Mr. K's Notion of the *Catholick Church* be true, then all the Churches that live under *Diocesan Prelates* as their spiritual Governors, or such unqualifi'd obtruded *Parish-Ministers*, are no part of the *Catholick Church*. So that if he retract not this new description of the *Catholick Church*, 'tis like to fall heavy on his own Party; and because I would not be so uncharitable to the Church of *England*, as he is to the Churches of Dissenters, I advise him the next time he undertakes to define the *Catholick Church*, to leave out this dangerous mark of it. At least he ought to apply this mark to the *Papists* as well as *Dissenters*; whereas among the Latin Questions; The 14th is, *Whether that be a true Church which has not lawful Pastors?* And Mr. K. thus answers, *It may be a true Church, witness the Church of Rome, which has had so many hæretical, schismatical, simoniacal ones, who were not all lawful Pastors; But did there therefore cease to be a Church at Rome?* But I perceive this is a true mark when he would vent his spleen against the *Presbyterian Churches* at home and abroad, but a false or uncertain one when it would unchurch the *Papists*. The best of it is, if it be a true mark, the *Papal* and *Diocesan Churches* are most concern'd in the dangerous consequences of it. All

All therefore I shall add on this Head, is a brief Answer to Mr. M's Question, What that Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church is which we profess to believe in the Creed?

Ans^r. We need go no farther for the resolution of this Question, than the Text quoted by Mr. K. 4 *Eph.* 3, 4, 5. Only I must premise, that the *Catholick Church* in its true extent includes the Church Triumphant as well as the Church Militant; nay, all the Saints that have been, are, or shall be on earth to the end of the world; see Mr. *Claud's Reponse au livre de Mons^r. l'Evesq; de Meaux, &c.* p. 7, 8, 9, &c. But if we speak of the *Catholick Church* as militant on earth, it must be considered either as measured by the judgment of God, which discerns the truth of things from all hypocritical disguises, or as measur'd by the judgment of humane Charity. As measur'd by the judgment of God, 'tis according to the fore-quoted Text, *One body or society animated by one holy Spirit, having one heavenly hope, subjected to one Lord Jesus, believing the same revealed Doctrine as to all necessary Articles, and devoted by one Baptismal Covenant to one heavenly Father.* This Body is call'd *Invisible*, or *Mystical*, from that internal Faith and Holiness which are invisible; and 'tis also *Visible* by the external profession of that true Faith and Holiness. And this is that Church which we profess to believe in the Creed, in which alone we can expect to find the true Communion of Saints; And to this Church alone all promises of saving Blessings are made in the holy Scriptures. * But the Catholick Church, as measur'd by the judgment of human Charity, comprizes all that make a credible profession of Christian Faith and Holiness. For we are incapable to distinguish the true and living members of the Church from those that only appear to be so. And therefore the Catholick Church, as estimated by our charity, is more large and comprehensive than the real Body of Christ. For *Hypocrites* are no true members of his Body, tho' mixt with them in the same external Society by their external Profession; or as St. *John* distinguishes, they are among them, but not of them, 1 *Joh.* 2. v. 19. They are but *blasted Ears*, not the true *Wheat*; they are members of the Church Catholick

* The judgment of several Fathers to this purpose, and particularly St. Augustin: see quoted in that fore-cited discourse of Mr. Claud from p. 45 to 68.

in appearance, not in reality. The Church Catholick, as measured by our charitable judgment, is I know commonly call'd the Church-Catholick-Visible, i.e. the Church Catholick, as estimated by an external or visible profession. But I wou'd choose rather for avoiding confusion, to call it the Visible Church Catholick mixt: For the Church Catholick in the proper sense, (as constituted of its living, or as the Schools speak, its univocal members, real Saints) is also *Visible*, because its members not only *believe with the heart*, but *confess with the mouth to salvation*, as the Apostle Paul speaks, *Rom. 10. v. 10*. But these real Saints do not make up one *distinct* external society by themselves, but as mixt with a crowd of Hypocrites, who join with them in the same external profession of Christianity; Nor are they exactly distinguishable from Hypocrites in our Judgment, which cannot pierce into the hearts of men, and only looks at the credibility of their external profession. If therefore it be enquir'd, what is the true Catholick Church? We must answer, All sincere Christians, who are *one* body or society by their belief of, and subjection to Jesus Christ their common Head and center of Unity. If it be enquir'd, whom should we in charity judge to be members of the Catholick Church, the Answer is obvious; All that make a credible profession of that Faith and that subjection. If it be askt further, what is a credible profession? 'tis answer'd, A profession not contradicted by notorious ignorance of the *essentials* of Christianity, by *fundamental Errors*, or by *notorious wickedness*. And he that would prove any particular Church or Churches, that call themselves Christian, to be no parts of the Catholick Church, must prove that they deny, or at least do not profess some essential Article of the Christian Faith, or are notoriously ungodly. (I add notoriously ungodly, because subjection to the laws of Christ is as necessary to our being the true members of his Church, as belief of his Doctrine; and consequently a credible profession of that subjection, as requisite to our being esteemed such). And therefore D. M. has very little reason to value himself upon this Question: And the Church of Rome has so little reason to arrogate to her self the Title of the

the Church Catholick, that a man must be very charitable to allow her to be a part of it; but no wise man will allow her to be any other than the most corrupt and unsound part of it. For that Church has gone so near towards the subverting the essential truths and laws of Christianity by their dangerous corruptions in Doctrine, Worship and Practice, that it would be the best service D. M. can do her, to demonstrate clearly that there is a credible profession of Christianity left amongst those that practically hold all the Decisions of the Council of Trent, *ex. gr.* To reconcile that Doctrine of their Council that imperfect Contrition or Attrition is sufficient to dispose a man for Absolution in the Sacrament of Penance, Council of Trent, *Session 4. cap. 4.* with that necessary Doctrine of the Gospel, *Without Repentance there is no Remission of Sins.* To reconcile the worship of the Church of Rome with the second Commandment, is a task well worthy of D. M's pains. But I hope in many that live in the communion of the Church of Rome, the common principles of Christianity which they retain, prevail against the poysonous additions of Popery; and all the Doctrines of that and other Councils are not practically held by them. But their claim to be a part of the Church Catholick is not near so clear and indisputable as that of the Reformed Churches, whose Doctrine and Worship compar'd with the holy Scriptures, evidence them to be an incomparably sounder part of it; tho even all the Reformed Churches are not equal in their soundness and purity.

This Catholick Church hath only one universal Head Jesus Christ, and is one Body only on the account of its union with, and subjection to him. Nor is there any *Vicarious* universal Head under Christ to which the Government of the Church Catholick is committed, whether Pope, General, Council, or Colledge of Prelates; Nor can any such humane Head make Laws obligatory to the universal Church. For any to pretend to it is an usurpation of Christ's Legislative power; and is chiefly on the account of that *Usurpation*, and employing that usurped power to deprave the Church, and destroy its soundest members, that the Protestants have call'd the Pope *Antichrist*.

Particular Churches are the chief Integrating parts of the Church Catholick; (I speak of it here as measur'd by the judgment of charity). As to any of these particular Churches, in the Quest. be, Are they a part of the Catholick Church? It must be resolv'd by the credibility of their Christian Profession. If th. Question be, Are they Churches regularly constituted or organiz'd? 'Tis in the resolution of this Quest. We must consider, whether they be a society of Christians united under one or more such Pastors as Christ has appointed, for personal communion in Faith, Worship and holy living; and whether their Pastors were in a regular manner set over them. And here the dispute about lawful *Spiritual Governors* must come in. For that a particular Church have a lawful Pastor, is not absolutely necessary to its being a true Church, and consequently a true part of the Catholick Church (as Mr. K. himself acknowledges in the fore-quoted place, p. 90. tho' how he will reconcile that Concession with his description of the Catholick Church, I do not understand). 'Tis only necessary to its being a Church regularly constituted. And who are such lawful Pastors, there will be occasion to discuss in answer to the 4th Quest.

The second Quest. is, Whether by the Church Catholick be meant the Church of *England* alone, or the Church of *England* in communion with other Churches?

Mr. K. well replys, The Church of *England* is no more the Catholick Church, than the *British Seas* are the whole Ocean. But he does ill, to found its being a part of the Catholick Church on its subjection to Catholick Bishops. I suppose he means Diocesan Bishops. For it wou'd not cease to be a part of the catholick Church, if it shou'd disown Diocesan Prelacy. And if Mr. K. think otherwise, he has these two difficult Propositions to prove; First, that Jesus Christ has instituted the Office of Diocesan Prelates, in his church; and secondly, that he has made such Prelates the center of catholick Unity, and subjection to them necessary to our being members of the catholick church. Now if Mr. K. will undertake the defence of these two Propositions, he not only unchurches all the Reformed

formed Churches that want *Diocesan Prelacy*, but even the Catholick Church it self for a *Century* or two at least, as I offer to evince, if Mr. K. please to demand it. For communion with other Churches, it must be understood in the essentials of Christian Religion; for it can scarce be expected in all its integrals in this imperfect state, but much less in unnecessary humane additions to Christianity: And we must not confound communion with subjection; the former may be due where the latter is not.

The third Quest. is, With what other Church does the Church of England communicate in Sacraments and Liturgy? Mr. K. well answers, That *Unity in Liturgy* is no part of communion of Churches; and that the Church of England (and had his charity been wide enough, he might lately have added also, the Churches call'd *Presbyterian* and *Independent*) is united with all other Christians in the participation of the same Sacraments: And I doubt not the *Presby.* and *Indep.* Churches administer them as agreeably to our Saviours Institution as any other. I come therefore to the

4th. Quest. Whether by the Catholick Church be meant the variety of all *Protestants*, since they want her essential mark, *Unity*?

Before I consider Mr. K's answer to the Quest. I shall offer one that is very obvious, and (I doubt not) more agreeable to the temper of every true Catholick and charitable Christian, viz.

That all the Reformed Churches whose publick Confessions of Faith are extant, are true parts of the Catholick Church; tho some of them may be more, others less pure and uncorrupted. (Of *Quakers* we can make no judgment, because we know not what their opinions are, and tis well if they do so themselves. For *Fifth-Monarchy* men, I know no distinct Churches constituted of them; and if they hold no other Notion of a *Fifth-Monarchy* than the learned Mr. Mede on the Rev. seems inclin'd to believe, I hope Mr. K. will not think it inconsistent with salvation.)

If D. M. ask where is the essential mark of the Church Catholick,

tholick, viz. *Unity* among the *Episcopal, Presbyt. Indep. and Anabapt. Churches*?

Ans. What *Unity* does he mean? If an *Unity* in the essentials of *Christian Faith* and *Holiness*, let him name me one of these Churches that denies any essential Article of the *Christian Religion*, or one Precept of the *moral Law*; nay, or one essential part of *Divine Worship*, as Praise, Prayer, Preaching; or one Sacrament instituted by Jesus Christ. For tho the *Anabaptists* deny the Baptizing of Infants, yet they do not deny Baptism it self; and however I may judge them mistaken in that point, I should think him more dangerously mistaken that should on the account of their Error in so intricate a controversy condemn them as no part of the *Catholick Church*. I will not patronize all the irregularities that may be objected in some of these Churches, but my charity does oblige me to add, that they are not such as invalidate the credibility of their *Christian Profession*, nor the thousandth part so gross as the corruptions of the *Greek and Roman Churches*.

Or does Mr. M. mean by *Catholick Unity*, an *Unity* in an humane universal Head of the Church, as *Pope* or *Council*? This is no better than an *Unity* in owning a gross Usurper that invades the Prerogatives of our blessed Lord, the only Head of his Church, that claims an universal power over his Church, without any commission from him. Or does he mean, an *Unity* in all the Errors, Idolatry, Superstition, and corrupt practices that have by degrees crept into the Church, and overrun any considerable part of it? I hope he will not make this the mark of the *Catholick Church's Unity*, no more than he would make mens diseases a mark of their unity in the humane nature. This is an *Unity* to be avoided, not courted or desir'd. Or does he mean an *Unity* in humane unnecessary Canons that shall reduce all Christians to an exact uniformity in the external modes of Religion? This is an *Unity* never to be effected, but either by reducing mens judgments to an uniformity about those matters, or by forcing them to comply with what their judgments condemn. The former is morally impossible, considering the different degrees of our knowledge in this imperfect

fect state on earth ; and one might as wisely attempt to bring all Nations to affect the same civil customs, ceremonies, or garb. The *latter* is a *lording it over God's heritage, and exercising a dominion over the Faith of Christians* in the highest degree, which the Apostles themselves disclaim and forbid, 2 Cor. 1. 24. 2 Pet. 5. 3. A uniformity in humane rites is no unity prescrib'd in the word of God ; and consequently not necessary to the constitution of the Catholick Church. The laws of Christ, which alone are obligatory to the Catholick Church, have made sufficient provision for its Unity as far as 'tis attainable on earth; (for perfect Unity is the effect of the perfect light and love of Heaven). And for any single person, or collective body of Pastors to prescribe other terms of Unity to the Catholick Church than Christ has done, is not only an usurpation of his legislative power, but one of the most effectual methods that Hell has found out to raise Schisms and Divisions in it, and thereby to destroy Christian love. And he that knows not how fatal an Engine the needless and corrupt impositions of ambitious Prelates and their Councils have been above these 1300 years to deprave and tear the Christian Church, under pretence of reducing it to an impossible Uniformity, is either a stranger to Church-History, or has too deep a tincture of that wretched pride and ignorance that has animated imperious Patriarchs and Popes.

I proceed now to consider Mr. K's Answer to D. M's Quest. which I shall transcribe at large.

Neither are all Protestants Catholick Members of the Church, nor they only. Those among Protestants that embrace the Catholick Faith, and make no separation from their lawful Governors, and that live in Unity of Faith and Charity with their neighbour Churches, are catholick members; and have that unity which is essential to the catholick church. But these are not to be confounded with Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, Fifth-monarchy men, Quakers, &c. since these have separated themselves from their lawful Governors, as much as Mr. M. himself; though their crime be less than his; as he is less guilty that makes a rebellion, than he who joyns with a Forreigner to enslave his country.

I did not expect a man of Mr. K's abilities cou'd have betrayed so much *ignorance* or *uncharitableness*, or *both*, in answering so easy a Question. If the *Dissenters* be guilty of Schism, I am sure 'tis not half so gross and palpable as what this one Paragraph contains, nor so opposite to true christian love.

Mr. K. who charges D. M. for talking of things without clearing them, would do well to take his own advice. 'Tis hard to imagine what he means by *Catholick members* of the Church. Does he mean the same by it, as *members of the catholic church*, or no?

If he do not, what signifies his Answer to D. M's Question, which was, *Whether the church catholic contain all the variety of Protestants who want her essential mark, viz. Unity?* Nay, why does he assert those Protestants *only*, whom he here describes to have that Unity which is *essential* to the Catholick Church? For none can be members of the Catholick Church, but such as are united with their fellow members in those things which *essentially* constitute them *one* Church or Body. *Catholick members* of the Church is no very proper expression, 'tis like *total parts*, and can have no tolerable sense distinct from that plainer expression, *Members of the catholic church*. If Mr. K. make any distinction betwixt these two phrases, it must be founded on the supposition of some vicarious Head of Unity to the Catholick Church, which we condemn the Church of *Rome* for setting up, and Mr. K. himself seems to disown, p. 55. Nor wou'd that *Hypothesis* it self justify the distinction; because if Christ have made any Vicarious Head or center of Unity to the Catholick Church, we cou'd not be united to him as his members without union with that Vicarious Head. So that to be Catholick members of the Church, and members of the Catholick Church, are the same thing.

And if Mr. K. use that expression in this sense, let us consider a little the description he gives of those who are Catholick members of the Church. Here are three characters to know them by; Their *embracing the catholic Faith*, their *making no separation from their lawful Governors*, their *living in charity with their neighbour churches*:

The first is, *Embracing the Catholick Faith* (and he shou'd have added, *Professing catholick holiness of life*). For this character 'tis undeniable, and I hope Mr. K. will not exclude any of the forementioned Protestant Churches from being Catholick members of the Church on this score.

The two latter Mr. K. himself will find too dangerous and too schismatical to own upon second thoughts.

For from the third, *viz. living in charity with their neighbour churches*, I infer ;

1st. That this character does exclude a'l the *Papists* from being catholick members of the Church ; for they are so far from living in charity with their neighbour Churches, that their *Trent-creed* does assert its Articles to be that catholick Faith without which no man can be saved, and consequently damns all the Churches in the world besides their own.

2. On supposition the Reformed Churches abroad which have not Diocesan Bishops, be true Churches, this character excludes all those of the Church of *England* from being catholick members of the Church, who do, with Mr. *Dodwell* unchurch all those Reformed Churches that want Prelatical Ordination. For to unchurch them, is not to live in charity with them.

3. If the Churches of the *Presbyt. and Indep.* here be true Churches, (as I shall in this Paper evince they are), then Mr. K. and all that are of his mind, are no catholick members of the Church, because they live not in charity with their neighbour Churches. (And I hope there is not the less charity due to them for being of the same countrey or Nation) : for Mr. K. makes subjection to lawful Pastors a mark of the members of the catholick Church, p. 4. and declares the *Presbyt. &c.* destitute of that mark, p. 6. And consequently denys them to be members of the catholick church, which is the highest breach of charity imaginable. And what if the *Presbyt.* shou'd treat Mr. K. according to his own principle, and declare him no catholick member, because he lives not in charity with them? They would but use his own weapons against himself. But (however they have been misrepresented) they are not of that schismatical humour as some are, who have long made a loud outcry against Schism.

4. Nay, if this character be true, then in all those contentions that have happen'd in the Church where the contending Parties have been so uncharitable as to excommunicate one another tho sometimes about meer trifles; the one Party or both have ceast to be catholick members of the church. And so when Pope *Victor* excommunicated the *Eastern* churches for not keeping *Easter* on the same day with him, He and all that joyn'd with him ceast to be catholick members of the church. And if to be *catholick members of the Church, and members of the catholick Church* be the same, what a vast part of the christian world has been unchurch'd in every age by the uncharitable censures of proud contentious Prelates!

I suppose Mr. *K.* never considered these consequences, or else he would never have made living in charity with neighbour Churches a necessary mark of the catholick members of the Church. As if the *legitimate children* of the same Father might not in an angry mood call one another *Bastards*, or the subjects of the same King in a pievish humour nickname their fellow subjects *Rebells* without any just cause. I am sure, the *Presbyterian* Churches both at home and abroad are the least concern'd in this character; for they have never unchurcht the *Prelatical* Churches, even when they have met with the most harsh and unreasonable treatment from them.

But Mr. *K.* has given us another character to distinguish the Catholick members of the Church by, which he imagines will exclude all the *Presbyterians, Independents, &c.* from that number, viz.

That they are such as *make no separation from their lawful Governors.*

All this is founded on his schismatical mark of the catholick Church, viz. *That its members live under their lawful spiritual Governors.* Here therefore all those difficulties occur about the meaning of lawful spiritual Governors which were propos'd, p: 3, 4, 5 6, 7. And which sense soever Mr. *K.* chooses, he will find it does oblige him to unchurch a great part of the Catholick Church, i. e. to be a *schismatick* of the worst sort. And if the laws of Christ must determine the debate he will give the

Dis.

Dissenters such an Argument against *Prelatical Churches* being members of the *Catholick*, as he will never be able to answer: And Mr. *Baxter's Treatise*, which proves the *unlawfulness of Diocesan Prelacy*, has, according to Mr. *K.* done what that charitable man never intended, unchurcht all our *Diocesan Churches*, and cashierd them from being any part of the *Church-Catholick*.

There is no doubt but unjust separation from any lawful spiritual Governors is a sinful practice: And particular Churches gather'd by such a sinful separation, are not gather'd in a *regular* way. And therefore an unjust violation of due Order, is all that Mr. *K.* can justly pretend to charge the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* with, and perhaps will find it a more difficult task than he imagines, to make good that charge.

And therefore to clear this matter, let me premise; *Particular Churches* are the chief integrating parts of the *Church-Catholick*. These Churches consist of one or more Pastors, and a Christian Flock associated under his or their oversight for *personal* communion in Faith, Worship, and holy living. These Churches are obliged by the very dictates of the light of nature, and general rules of the holy Scripture, to endeavour the preservation of all necessary Unity, by the amicable consultations of their associated Pastors. The judgment of such associated Pastors should be submitted to by the people under their care, when 'tis not repugnant to the Word of God, and contrary to the interest of Religion. But the people do not owe them a *blind obedience*, nor have such Pastors any power but for *edification*. Much less can such Bishops pretend to an higher power, whose very Office Christ never instituted, whose pretended relation to their Diocess is not founded on the peoples consent to it; and if such Bishops should claim the sole power of *Church-Government* in a Nation, and exercise it against the will of Christ to the notorious detriment of sou's, (as by unjust silencing of faithful Pastors when their labours are high'y conducive to the Churches good, by imposing on the people sinful conditions of Church-communion, by obtruding unqualifi'd Pastors on the people against their consent, &c.) To separate

from such Bishops so far as to disobey these unjust commands, is no separation from our lawful Governors; and is no more a *Rebellion in the Church*, than 'tis a Rebellion in the State to disobey one that usurps his power he never receiv'd from the King, and which he exercises against the laws and interest of the Kingdom.

And therefore I would propose these two Questions to Mr. K. in reference to this Head.

Q. 1. On supposition the *Presby's and Indep's* have made an unjust separation from their lawful Governors whom they should have submitted to, *Whether this be such a crime as will exclude them from being Catholick members of the Church?*

To resolve that, We must consider the nature of their separation. Their Ministers separate from the Bishops, i. e. they are not willing to obey them in what they account a sinful and dangerous usurpation, viz. the assuming the sole power of Church-Government, and depriving the Pastors of particular Churches of an essential part of their Office, and suspending them unjustly. Their people separate from the Parish Ministers, but 'tis not by disowning them, as no true Ministers, but by refusing to receive them as *theirs*, because they judge they have a right to choose a Physician for their Souls as well as for their Bodies; and therefore think not themselves bound to acquiesce in the *Patrons or Bishops* choice, when contrary to their own edification; especially when there are terms of Parish-communion impos'd, to some *unlawful*, to others *greatly suspected*; and, all true Church-discipline is cast out or neglected. They separate not from the conforming Churches as no true Churches, but as preferring the ordinary communion of *puer*; because they judge the laws about Parish-order do not oblige, when injurious to the interest of Religion and Souls. Now suppose them mistaken in these matters through the weakness of their judgment; will this sort of separation make them cease to be *Catholick* members of the Church? 'Tis not a separation from any thing *Christ* has made necessary to the unity of his Church, 'tis only a separation from some *humane* order, which they dare not comply with, because they

apprehend it contrary to the laws of *Christ*. And is this to be compar'd to a Rebellion in the State? (as he is pleas'd to do, p. 6.) Is the convocation, *Christ*? or *their Canons* equally obligatory as *his laws*? or do those that disobey the *Canons* of the Convocation, because they judge them opposite to the laws of *Christ*, renounce their Allegiance to him as the Head of his Church? Are their *Canons* even about things they call *indifferent*, as necessary to be obey'd, as the undoubted Rules of the Gospel, by all that would be *Catholick members* of the Church, when those that are requir'd to obey them, fear the things commanded are unlawful? When I read such expressions as this about *Church-Rebellion*, I cannot but lament the effects of humane ignorance and pride, and observe in such as Mr. A. some degrees of that spirit that has acted Papal Councils, who made no scruple of treating all that would not pay them a blind obedience with such characters as these. And I know no better way to convince Mr. A. of the folly of this Principle I am opposing, than by shewing him how pernicious the consequences of it are to his own Party.

For if this sort of Schism which he supposes the *Dissenters* guilty of, prove them to be no *Catholick members* of the Church, then sure more heinous Schism will prove those to be in the same condition who are guilty of it. Greater Schism is more opposite to *Catholick Unity* than lesser. But the *Prelates* are guilty of more heinous Schism than this of the *Dissenters* supposing it to be Schism; and consequently if Mr. A's principle be true, are no *Catholick members* of the Church. That the *Prelates* are guilty of more heinous Schism, I offer this Argument to evince. Those who impose unnecessary and and doubtful terms of *Church-Communion*, nay, who declare many thousands of true *Christians ipso facto excommunicated*, are greater Schismatics than those who only scruple those terms, tho' through mistake, and who unchurch not those *Churches* which they are thus forc'd to separate from. For the Schism of the *Imposers* is more voluntary and curable by forbearing to prescribe such terms of *Communion* as are more likely to prove engines of Division; The Schism of the *Refusers* is

more *involuntary*, and in doubtful cases often incurable. And 'tis more opposite to *Christian Love* to excommunicate thousands of sincere *Christians*, than 'tis to prefer those *Churches* which we upon the best enquiry judge more pure before those that seem more corrupt without unchurching them; even tho in so doing we should be guilty of some breach of the Churches peace, by violating a tolerable humane order: So that all Mr. K. will gain by excluding *Dissenters* from the *Catholick Church* on the account of their Schism, will be, That by the same reason, our *Convocation* were no *Catholick members* of it; and if so, I am sure they are no lawful *Governors* in it.

For what I have here asserted, that the *Convocation* have excommunicated thousands of sincere *Christians*, and that *ipso facto*, I appeal to their *Canons*, and to the consciences of any that peruse them, and know the *Nonconformists* in these Kingdoms, few whereof are not by some of these *Canons ipso facto* excommunicated. See Mr. *Baxter's English Schismatick detected*, who from p. 42. to the 50th. recites the particular *Canons*.

Nay, if all that are guilty of equal Schism with that of the *Dissenters* (supposing them guilty) be no *Catholick members* of the Church, I fear there are few such in the World. Sure the Schism of the *Papists* is of a more monstrous nature, who unchurch all the Churches on earth besides themselves. And the *Greeks* pay them in the same coyn. And if other of the *Eastern Churches* do not unchurch one another, they have lost their old wont. What dreadful work Councils have made in *bereticating* and *unchurching* one another upon very unjustifiable grounds, fill's up both pages in *Church-History*. And as such were more heinous *Schismaticks* than those that are guilty only of *passive separation*, (*i. e.* separation occasion'd by mens scrupling the lawfulness of some humane *Canons*); so according to this notion, they were no *Catholick members* of the Church: And at this senseless rate we may soon reduce the *Catholick Church* to a small compass. And what would become even of the *Christian World*, if the compassions of our blessed Lord were as narrow as the charity of such censorious *Christians*.

The 2d. *Quest.* I wou'd propose to Mr. K. is,
Upon what grounds does he assert that the Presbyterians, Independents, &c. have made a separation from their lawful spiritual Governors?

This *Quest.* relates to the regular constitution of their Churches; Who then are the *lawful Pastors* of these *Presbyterians, &c.* from whom they have separated? Does he mean the *Bishops*, or the *Parish-Ministers*?

If the *Bishops*, they must be consider'd either as the *King's Officers*, to execute that civil power which he has *circa sacra*; And so the *Presbyterians* submit to them, and separate not from them; Or they must be consider'd as *Christs Officers*, to exercise that spiritual power which his *Charter* gives; and as such, the *Presbyterians* are very ready to submit to them, when they have prov'd the *divine Right* of their *Office*: Or they must be consider'd as the *Churches Officers*; and if so, 'tis requisite, that Church should obey them, who assign them their *Office*, or consent to be their subjects; not those who account their *Office* a sinful usurpation, and are the more unwilling to become their Subjects, because they cannot be so without complying with sinful Impositions, and even approving their usurpation: And that any Church may lawfully constitute new Officers whom Christ never appointed, and subject his undoubted Officers to their Authority, especially such as *Diocesan Prelates*, who by engrossing the power of the Keys, render *Church discipline* impracticable, is a proposition Mr. K. will hardly prove.

If the *Parish-Ministers* be the *lawful Governors* they separate from, I would willingly know how they come to be the *lawful Governors* or *Pastors* to those that consent not to their *Pastoral* relation, and have sufficient reasons why they do not? Will Mr. K. say, that all persons ought to commit the conduct of their Souls to that Minister whom the *Bishops* or *Patron* chooses? and that 'tis sinful separation not to do so? I wou'd then enquire; What does he think of those *Parishes* that are so large, that scarce the tenth part of the people can enjoy the labours of the *Parish-Ministers*, as *Stepney, Giles, Martins, and Cripple-*

Cripplegate Parishes in *London*, which have one with another 30000 or 40000 souls in each of them? Does he think it an unlawful separation for that part of the people that cannot have room in the *Parish Churches*, to attend the *Ministrations* of other pious and judicious *Pastors*? Is this such a separation too as will exclude them from the *Catholick Church*? To assert this, is to prefer a point of humane order (or rather disorder) about *Parish-bounds* before the *salvation of souls*; and in effect to say, that 'twere better all those people should want the ordinary means of salvation, and live like *Pagans* or *Archerfs* without any publick worship of God, than such a point of Church-order be violated. And if any can believe all this, 'tis very much to be doubted whether they know what *souls* and their *salvation* are.

Again, What does *Mr. K.* think of such *Parish-Ministers* as want the necessary qualifications, such as are notoriously ignorant, or scandalously wicked? Do those in their *Parishes*, who after having sought redress in vain, choose other *Ministers* of eminent learning and holiness, make a sinful separation, even such as will argue them no *Catholick members* of the *Church*? If he say this, he still prefers a meer point of humane order before the end of it, the *edification of souls*; and had rather hazard their damnation, than have a scandalous *Parish Minister* disown'd, whose *Life* is more likely to debauch, than his *Doctrine* to reform his *Hearers*.

I might insist on many such Questions as these; but because *Mr. K.* has not thought fit to give us any reason why he takes the *Parish-Ministers* for the only *lawful Governors*, even to those *Nonconformists* that consent not to their pastoral relation, I shall for their vindication offer this argument, to prove that the *Nonconformists* live under their *lawful spiritual Governors* or *Pastors*, and consequently make no separation from them.

I instance in the *Presbyterians*;
 These are the *lawful spiritual Governors* of particular *Christian Flocks* or *Churches*, who have all the qualifications requisite, a *valid Ordination*, the consent of those *Churches*, and who in taking the oversight of them violate no law of God, nor any just law of man.

But

But such are the Pastors of the Presbyterian Churches in these Kingdoms; E. they are the lawful Pastors of those Churches.

The minor Prop. alone needs proof, viz. That the Pastors of the Presbyt. Churches are such as are here describ'd.

For their Qualifications, and the consent of the people; that is matter of fact, concerning which, they may safely appeal to those that know them: only I would here suggest, that a considerable number of Ministers who prescribe various difficult exercises to a Candidate for the trial of his abilities, are as likely to judge of them as one single Bishop, who usually commits the examination of them to his Chaplain. For the validity of their Ordination, I undertake to make that good in answer to the Questions about Mission. The only doubt then remaining is, Whether these Pastors in taking the oversight of their flocks, do violate any law of God, or any just law of man?

1. For the laws of God, I cannot understand any that they should be supposed to violate, but either that law that enjoyns us to obey Superiors, or such as enjoyn the preservation of the Churches peace.

For the former, it falls in with what doubt may arise concerning the laws of men.

For the latter, the precepts of God which concern the Churches peace, I need only say these two things to clear them from the suspicion of violating them.

1. That the great duties recommended in the holy Scriptures in order to the preservation of the Churches peace, are a mutual forbearance in things indifferent, and a charitable judgment of each other in lesser differences.

This is evident from the 14th Chapt. of the Ep. to the Rom. to the 17th ver. of the 15th. where these duties are at large press'd from great variety of Topics, and urg'd on those that had Pastors among them. And to say, this great Rule, only oblig'd Christians to these duties till the Clergy had determin'd those indifferent things, and by their imposing them, cast out all Dissenters, is too like the confidence of those Gentlemen who own Christ instituted the Communion in both kinds. But tell us his Institution obliges not, now the Church has pleas'd to

to command it shall be otherwise. And I do appeal to any impartial judg, whether the *Convocation* or the *Presbyterians* have better observ'd this great Rule that concerns the Churches peace; But,

2. *No Law of God enjoyns us to do any thing sinful for the Churches peace.*

But for the Pastors of the presbyterian churches to desert their ministerial Office when never justly forbidden, and when their labours were highly conducive to the Interest of Religion and the Salvation of souls, were *sinful*. Methinks those Men that are so zealous to exclaim against all alienation of churchlands and utensils as Sacriledg and a very horrid sin, shou'd see something equally hainous if not more so, in mens alienating those excellent gifts God has endued them with for the Churches Edification, when never justly forbidden the exercise of that Ministry to which they are devoted. They who are justly call'd to that office by *men*, are call'd by *Christ*, and are bound to be true and faithful to *him*. And where there is a true necessity of their labours, they may answer their unjust silencers, as *Peter & John* did; *Acts 4.19 Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judg ye. Timothy*, who was ordain'd by men, yet has that solemn charge given him, *2 Tim. 4.1,2.* that is sufficient to deter Ministers from denying their Lord the service they have vow'd him, to please the unjust will of men. I know but one case that will excuse a Minister unjustly silenc'd in forbearing the exercise of his Ministry, *viz.* when there is no necessity of his labours; and the exercise of his Ministry would by violating publick order do more hurt than good in his present circumstances. But 'tis too evident, this was not the case of those 2000 Ministers silenc'd by the *Act of Uniformity*. To that purpose, let the consequences of their *continuing* or *forbearing* their Ministry be compar'd. What was the inconvenience of their Preaching more than this, that a point of humane order was violated; some needless impositions (to speak the mildest) not comply'd with, (which were design'd to promote an impracticable uniformity, but were more likely to prove engines of corrupting and dividing the Church);

Church); and the unjust will of the Silencers disobey'd. What was the advantage of their continuing their Ministry? It may be justly said to the honour of God, that many thousands of ignorant souls have been instructed in the truths of the Gospel, and by true conversion or repentance added to the number of Christ's mystical body; the honour of Christianity has been promoted by the purity of their societies through the faithful exercise of Church-discipline; the serious practice of Religion has been more effectually maintain'd in a profane and debauched age; And (what I would chiefly recommend to your consideration) a vast number of souls have enjoy'd the suitable and successful means of their Edification and Salvation, who either through the irregularity of Parish-bounds, or through their own scruples about the terms of Parish-communion, must else have wanted them; or through the ill provision of Parish-Ministers must have sat under such Pastors as no man concern'd for his own eternal happiness should be satisfied with where he may have better. For the truth of these things, the silenced Ministers may freely appeal to those that know them, and have any serious sense of these matters. But they will not much regard the judgment of those who think there is no need of any other conversion than from the external profession of a false Religion to the profession of a true; And no Regeneration but external Baptism, who account all sufficiently qualified to take a pastoral charge of souls who have got into holy Orders; and think the people bound in complaisance to the Patron, or the Bishop to acquiesce in their choice, tho it deprive them of the most probable means of their salvation, and oblige them to sit under those as their Pastors, from whose labours little success can be rationally expected. But for such as understand the real necessities and value of souls; and know how much the success of Ministers does ordinarily depend on their moral aptitude and abilities for that sacred Office; and have learnt to prefer the Edification and Salvation of Souls before external order, when inconsistent with it: Let them judge, whether the foresaid Ministers had not sinned, had they in these circumstances deserted their Ministry, and denied their help to

E

those

those that needed, and earnestly crav'd it? *i. e.* Whether it were better that in our large Parish-Churches thousands should live without any publick worship of God, or means of salvation; Or that all who scruple the imposed conditions of lay-com-munion shou'd live without Pastors till they can change their judgment; Or that the people in a vast number of Parishes should live under such as their Pastors as no serious Christian would commit the conduct of his soul to, where he may have better; Or that irreligion should prevail through the total neglect of Church-Discipline: In a word, whether it were better all the souls whom the *Nonconformist's Ministry* has been the Instrument within these 25 years to enlighten, sanctify, and prepare for Heaven, had never enjoy'd their labours, than the external order of Parish-bounds should be violated, and the suspected impositions (of things own'd by the Imposers for indifferent) disobey'd?

Now if it were sinful for the silenc'd Ministers to desert their office in such circumstances, because of an unjust prohibition; then no law of God that concerns the Churches peace, does oblige them to it. And that they were unjustly prohibited the exercise of their office, belongs to the next Head.

2. *The foresaid Ministers do in the exercise of their Ministry violate no just law of man.*

The humane Law which they violate, enjoyns such conditions of their office as these among others.

1. *A Declaration of unfeigned Assent and Consent to all things contained in and prescribed by the Book entituled the Book of Common-Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies, &c. and in the form and manner of making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons.*

2. *The Oxford Oath, or swearing never to endeavour any alteration of the present Church-Government.*

3. *Reordination as to those that had not Prelatical Ordination.*

4. *The Oath of Canonical Obedience, &c.*

Now if these conditions of the Ministry be sinful, I would gladly

g'adly know whether any humane law be just, that forbids the Ministers of our Lord Jesus to preach his Gospel, unless they will comply with sinful terms, or that makes *sinning* the condition of the exercise of their Ministry? I hope none will presume to say that which sets up the authority of *Man* against *God's*. I would therefore enquire further, *Ought all to forbear the exercise of their Ministry who are forbidden by an unjust humane Law?* If so, why did not *Christian Pastors* forbear it under *Pagan Emperors*. or the *Orthodox* under the *Arrian*, or *Reformed Pastors* under *Popish Princes*, where the law forbids them? Or will Mr. K. say, all these ought to have forborn and deserted their office. What! has God left it at the will of men whether he shall be publickly worshipt, whether his Gospel shall be preach'd, whether the Office he has call'd men to shall be discharg'd, whether souls shall enjoy the sutable means of their Salvation, or the number of Ministers shall be proportionable to the real necessity of souls? Has he given men any power against his own interest, or to promote the damnation of souls by imposing such terms of the Ministry as Christ's own Laws forbid his Ministers to obey? If all ought not to forbear their Ministry who are forbidden by an unjust Law, *What is there in the case of the silenc'd Ministers that should oblige them to it?* I know nothing can be imagin'd but this, That obedience to that Law, tho unjust, would in their circumstances tend more to the good of the Church and sou's, than all their ministerial labours. And if any can make this good, I doubt not but they will forbear. For proof of the contrary, see p. 27, 28. under the former Head.

All the Quest. therefore will be concerning the conditions of the Ministry, that by the foresaid Law were impos'd upon them.

For the first mentioned, the *Declaration of Assent and Consent*, &c.

Are there not many thousands of sincere and upright Christians in these Kingdoms, who do really judge *kneeling* at the Sacrament unlawful, because they account it a symbolizing with the Church of *Rome* in a ceremony abus'd to Idolatry?

who judge the *Cross in Baptism* unlawful, because 'tis a new *Tessera* or *symbol* of our Christian Profession of humane Institution, to which those very duties and blessings of the Gospel are annexed, which our Lord has annexed to Baptism, especially when the words of the *Canon* are, [*To dedicate them by that badge (the sign of the Cross) to the service of Christ, whose benefits beflow'd on them in Baptism the name of the Cross does represent*]? Or, who scruple the use of *Sponsors* in Baptism, to undertake that work which is the *Parents* duty, and not *theirs*, unless the Parent be incapable; and the more, because the 29th *Canon* of the *Church* saith [*No Parent shall be urged to be present, nor be admitted to answer as Godfather for his own child*]? He that knows not, there are many thousands who judge these things unlawful, and yet are persons as eminent for their piety as those that are otherwise minded, is either a stranger to these Nations, or has very little charity left. Whether these persons be mistaken in these scruples or no, I do not now dispute, nor is it necessary to my Argument to suppose them in the right; But I wou'd hope it will be granted me, that their credible profession of Religion gives them a right to all the seals of the Covenant; and that 'tis not lawful to debar *them* from the *Lords-Supper*, or their *children* from *Baptism* on the account of these scruples. To say otherwise, were to make it lawful for the Ministers of Christ to *reject* those whom they have all imaginable reason to believe that their Lord *receives*, nay, whom he has commanded them to receive, *Rom. 14: 1*. Whereas to reject such, is a heinous degree of Schism, and opposite to the great law of Charity and Christian forbearance, which *Pastors* as well as *people* are concerned in. 'Tis the very sin *Diotrephes* is charg'd with, *3 Ep. Joh. v. 10*.

Now if it be unlawful to deprive such of external Church privileges as in the judgment of rational Charity have a right to them, then 'tis unlawful to profess our Assent and Consent to a Book which obliges us to this Uncharitable and Schismatical practice; For the Book obliges us to administer the Sacraments only in the manner there prescribed, and by the Canons of the Church those Ministers incur the danger of *Suspension* that do otherwise

otherwise. So that we cannot be Ministers without approving these Schismatical Conditions of Church Communion, and perhaps excluding the most sober part of a Parish on the account of them. Whereas Christian Love forbids us to *Exclude* such, and much more forbids us to *Assent* and *Consent* to their *Exclusion*.

For the 2d. Condition of the Ministry, *That Clause in the Oxford Oath wherein we must swear never to endeavour any Alteration of Government in the Church.*

Do's Mr. K. think there are no Corruptions in the Government of the Church, which if alter'd and reform'd wou'd greatly conduce to the advancement of real Religion? Is the exercise of Church-Government by a *Lay-Chancellor* and the manner of their process in the *Spiritual Courts*, no corruption that needs amendment? What when so solemn a thing as the Censures of the Church is manag'd more like a design to correct mens purses then either the Errors of their Judgment or disorders of their Practice, and as Dr. Burnet in the life of Bishop Bedel complains, *That Excommunication had lost all its force as a Spiritual Censure and was dreaded only on the account of the effects it produc't in Law.* And these matters are not since chang'd for the better. Is that Discipline by which every particular Church shou'd be as much as possible preserv'd from the infection and scandal of notoriously wicked members, possible to be exercised by a *Bishop* or his *Lay-Chancellor* for a whole *Diocess* containing 3 or 4 hundred or perhaps as many more particular Churches? For Instance, Is the *Bishop of Lincoln* whose Diocess contains in it 1000 or 1100 Parish-Churches capable to call all the scandalous sinners within that vast Precinct to Repentance, to examine the crimes a'ledg'd against them, use all the admonitions and reproofs that tend to reclaim them and after due evidence of their impenitency cast them out of Church Communion? How many thousands must he have at once in his Court if he exercised Church Discipline as strictly as the H. Scriptures enjoyn or as the *Common-Prayer-Book* owns it was practis'd in the primitive Church. See *Pref: to the Communion used in Lent.* And does there need any plainer

Argu-

Argument of the impossibility of it, then that this Discipline was never actually exercised by the Bishops to any purpose, nor one scandalous sinner of a thousand in a Diocese ever call'd to Repentance for his notorious crimes or censured for his continuing in them (unless it were some scrupulous Nonconformist.) And does Mr. K. think these things need no alteration? If he doth so, I would gladly know, What Church-Government or Discipline signifies? To what purpose then is all this stir about an *Empty Name*, when there is no use to be made of the *Thing* to the great purposes it's intended for? when 'tis not exercised to preserve the honour of Religion by a credible profession of it in particular Churches, and to secure those Churches from the pernicious influence of such whom their Hæresies or their scandalous crimes render unfit for Christian Society?

If these things be gross abuses, If the present Church-Government render Discipline impracticable, and deprive Parish-Ministers of an essential part of their Office, Is it lawful to swear We will never endeavour an alteration of this, and that without any limitation signified, as [*in an irregular manner or beyond our particular Sphere?*] is it lawful for those who know these to be corruptions which have greatly depraved the Church and dishonoured Christianity to swear they will never endeavour to amend them? They might as well bind themselves by oath never to Repent nor Promote the Repentance of others.

If any say the meaning of the Oath is only, that they will never endeavour this [*by any sinful means, or beyond their private sphere*]; Why could not these necessary words be put in? And that this dangerous sense was never intended by the Convocation, is evident from the 7th Canon, where they thus speak; [*Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the Government of the Church of England under his Majesty, by Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Archdeacons, and the rest that bear Office in the same is Antichristian, or repugnant to the word of God, let him be excommunicate ipso facto, and so continue till he repent, and revoke such his wicked error*] They that thus suppos'd nothing in their Government repugnant to the word of God, did without doubt

doubt intend to bind the interior Clergy from *all attempts to alter it* ; and so contriv'd this Oath, that an Allegiance might be in these Nations sworn to the Bishops as well as the King.

For the 3d. viz. Reordination. The Divines of the Church of *England* generally own it *unlawful* ; and consequently, the imposition of it supposes Ordination by Presbyters a *Nullity*. For such therefore as were so ordain'd to consent to *Reordination*, is to own the *Nullity* of their former Administrations, and cast the basest slur on a great part of the *Reformed Ministry*. And this reminds me of a passage in the Preface to the Book of *Ordination*, which acquaints us with the judgment of those that compos'd it, *Viz.* [And to this intent, that these Orders be reverently esteem'd, No man shall be accounted or taken for a lawful Priest in the *Ch of Engl* or be suffer'd to execute the *Function*, except he be called according to this form, or hath had formerly *Episcopal Ordination*.] And this we must profess our Assent and Consent to; which he that can do, (and makes conscience of declaring nothing but what he really believes) has either a large stock of ignorance, or very little charity ; (as will appear by what is said on the Head about *Mission*). The Authors of that Preface cou'd not but foresee, that such Declarations wou'd effectually choke a great part of the Ministers in *England* and *Ireland*, and 'tis hard to imagine what other design they could have in requiring their Assent and Consent to such passages as these.

For the Oath of Canonical obedience viz. That the Priests or Deacons will reverently obey their Ordinary and other chief Ministers to whom is committed the Charge and Government over them.

I suppose 'Tis meant of obedience to their Ordinary in what he prescribes agreeably to the Canons which are the known Rule he governs by. And so we should be obliged to read the sentence of excommunication against all that the *Bishop* or his *Chancellor* may according to those Canons excommunicate, now he may excommunicate all *Nonconformists*.

And we that know them to be men of holy and blameless lives

lives, must swear to obey the Bishop, by publishing his *schismatical* sentence.

I might have added several things more on this Head, were it necessary.

I know some have told the world freely, that in their Declaration of Assent, &c. they intend no more than to receive these Books as an *Instrument of peace*; so that they will not preach against any thing contain'd in them, as some subscribe even the Articles themselves: To which I need only answer;

1. It us'd to be acknowledg'd by *Prot. Casuists*, (as 'tis largely asserted by Bishop *Sanderson de Juram.*) That to stretch the words of Laws, Oaths, and Promises to meanings different from their common use, is sinful, and a practice fitter for those that own the Doctrine of *Equivocations*, &c. than sincere Christians, or good subjects. Now if to *Assent and Consent to all things contain'd in, and prescrib'd by a Book*, be not an *Assent* to them as *true*, and *Consent* to them as *good or lawful*; 'tis impossible to understand the sense of those two words. And what might not a man in this *lax* sense declare his *Assent* and *Consent* to, tho never so much against his judgment, provided he did not think himself oblig'd to speak publick'y against it. That the *Parliament* never intended that *lax* sense, appears hence; That when the *House of Lords* added a *Proviso*, that the Declaration in the Act of Uniformity should be understood but as obliging men to the *use* of the Book, the *House of Commons* refus'd it at a Conference about it, and gave such reasons against that sense and *Proviso* to the *Lords*; upon which they acquiesc'd, and cast it out.

2. Whatever meaning be put on the forementioned declarations and oaths, None can exercise his Ministry in the *Church of England* without denying the privileges of Christianity to those that have a right to them and without quitting an essential part of his office as Pastor of a particular Church, or incurring the danger of suspension for doing otherwise. And the Ministers of Christ must not put themselves under such a necessity of acting uncharitably and schismatically towards his true Members, nor thus wilfully maim and deprave their Pastoral office.

I appeal

I appeal then to the Judgment of a'l, Whether if these conditions of the Ministry be sinful, That Law be just that shall enjoin them, and make mens forswearing themselves necessary to the preaching of the Gospel?

I am very sorry Mr. K. and some of his Coat should so often necessitate their Brethren to harp on this ungrateful string. They pay too great a deference to the Laws of the Land to cast any needless Reflections on them. But men ought not to bear silently the charge of *Schism* and *Church-Rebellion*, who are no way guilty of it. Especially when their silence and neglect to vindicate themselves may tempt others who are not acquainted with their case, to censure and hate them wrongfully, as cloth'd with these odious characters. I hope the precedent discourse has evidenc'd the charge to be undeserved and false. And therefore whatever expressions seem to grate on the Laws, must be imputed to the unhappy necessity put upon them to give a true representation of their case, by the virulent accusations of their brethren, from whom one wou'd think they might rather expect some pity. I doubt not but the moderate and charitable part of the *Conforming Clergy* have other apprehensions of their brethren, and are asham'd of these passages in M. K's Answer. But for those that approve the silencing Laws, arraign their Brethren as *Church-Rebels* for not obeying them, and condemn those Societies that need and embrace their help meerly on that score, as no parts of the Catholic Church, even when they exclude not the *Papish Churches*. It will appear, I think, from this Paper, that their Arguments are not so strong as their Passion, and a little more charity wou'd advance the reputation of their *Intellectuals* as well as *Morals*. Such men may long exclaim against our divisions, but their own principles and temper are the most insuperable obstacle to the healing of them:

Having considered the Questions in the Preface, I come to examine the first sett of those in the Pamphlet it self, which concern the Mission of the first Reformers, and they are by Mr. K. reduc'd to these five.

1. *What Priesthood or Holy Orders had the first Reformers but what they receiv'd from the hands of Roman-Catholick Bishops?*

2. *Who authoriz'd the first Reformers to preach their Protestant Doctrine, and administer their Protestant Sacraments?*

3. *Whether Cranmer and his Associates could condemn the Church of Rome by pretence of the Mission they received from her Bishops?*

4. *Whether a Presbyterian Minister having received Orders from a Protestant Bishop, can by virtue of such Orders pronounce the Church of England a corrupt Church?*

5. *Whether an Act of Parliament in France, Spain, or Germany, be not as good an Authority for Popery there, as in England for Protestantism?*

These are Questions one would think too ridiculous to be seriously propos'd. But I am heartily sorry Mr. K. can find no better Answer to them than what he has given, which in several passages runs too much on the same wretched mistakes that led Dr. Manby to offer them with so much confidence.

And therefore I need say little more to expose them, than first state the Controversy about Mission, and then apply the true Notion of it to these Questions.

There is a twofold Mission, Immediate or Mediate:

1. *Immediate*, Which those had whom God sent to deliver some extraordinary message, or some new revelation of his will to men. Such a Mission had the extraordinary Prophets under the old Testament, the Apostles and Evangelists under the new. And these brought some Credentials of their Mission to convince men of the truth of it. That immediate Mission is now ceas'd; the revelation of the Divine Will being compleated in the holy Scriptures, and directions given for the continuance of a Ministry in the Church. There is therefore,

2. *A Mediate Mission*, or Call to the Pastoral Office. (For we are not here concern'd with the office of Deacons), I mean that office of Bishops, or Elders, or Ministers (for they are but several names to import the same thing) so often describ'd in the holy Scriptures. The office contains in it many great and laborious

laborious works, *To teach the Flock committed to their charge, be their Guides in publick Worship, and rule them by Evangelical Discipline.* A Call to this Office gives the person call'd *authority* to do those works, and lays on him a personal obligation to do them. 'Tis from Christ alone that power is deriv'd by which men are authoriz'd and oblig'd. 'Tis his will express'd in the Gospel-Charter constitutes men his Ministers. And all that's further requisite, is, to know how he signifies his will concerning this or that particular person, being one of his Ministers.

To that purpose we must consider *what Christ has done already in the Gospel-Charter, and what he has design'd for men to do.*

Christ has already determined in the Gospel that there shall be a Ministry in his Church to the end of the World: He has describ'd their Office, and all the particular works of it; as what Doctrine they shall preach, what Worship they shall celebrate, how they shall rule the Church they oversee, and what Discipline they shall administer in it: He has left them sufficient rules in all matters of universal constant necessity for performing these works: He has describ'd the duties which Christian Flocks owe to such Pastors: He has assign'd the qualifications of such Pastors; He has made it the duty of people that need the labours of such qualified persons to seek their help, and of Ministers to call them out, approve, and invest them in that Office, and of the Civil Magistrate to protect the worthy.

It belongs not therefore to any men to appoint any new office in the Church of Christ, or main that Office he has instituted, or impose sinful conditions in order to its exercise, or impose any other duties on the people than he has done; much less does it belong to them to determine whether the Gospel shall be preach'd, or the necessities of souls who want such Pastors supply'd. All therefore that the Gospel has left to the Ordainers, is the *Designation* of the person to whom Christ's Charter shall convey the power, the *approbation* of his qualifications, and the *Installation*

vestiture of him, or solemnizing his admittance. The *Ordainers* therefore do not give the power to others as from themselves, nor does it pass through their hands, nor can they diminish it, as *ex gr.* should the Ordainers say, [Receive thou power to preach and administer the Sacraments, but not to rule the Flock:] This restraint or diminution is *null*, as being contrary to the *Charter of Christ*. They are but *Instruments of Inauguration*, as a *Recorder* that invests a *Mayor* in that office which the *King's Charter* gives him. And the great design of the *Interposition* of Pastors in this matter is, to secure to the Church a succession of able and blameless Pastors, of which they are supposed most fit to judge. *Ordination by Pastors* is God's ordinary regular way of admittance to prevent the Churches being deprav'd and injur'd by the *intrusion* of unqualified persons. And therefore it should not be neglected wherever it may be had. Only it must be added, that *the law of Christ* which determines, that the Gospel shall be preach'd by persons so qualified, is founded on *the necessity of souls*, and the *great law of Charity*; and therefore is of constant and indispensable necessity in the Church. But the command of their being *Ordain'd by Pastors*, is but subservient to the former, and relates only to the ordinary regular execution of it; and does not oblige where there is a *physical* or *moral impossibility* of observing it, and yet a *necessity of the Ministry*. For *Ordination by Pastors*, is not of *absolute necessity* to the being of the *Ministry*; There have been and may be extraordinary cases wherein a man may be obliged to be a Minister without it: To instance in two cases;

What if many *Christians* should be cast on the shore of some *Pagan Nation*, where they are forc'd to stay a considerable time, and one among them be more *eminently qualified* than the rest, to be their *Minister*; the rest entreat his help; and will any say, that the *Providence of God*, which has given him such abilities, does not sufficiently *authorise* him to exercise them in this case of necessity? When the *work of the Ministry* is of so much greater importance and necessity than that positive precept about the ordering of it. Nay, to propose a Case far more considerable:

What

What if all the present Pastors in a Nation should *corrupt* the *Christian Doctrine and Worship*, and *impose* those *corruptions* on the people as terms of *Church Communion*? What if they refuse to *ordain any that will not joyn with them herein*? The people dare not comply with those terms, and because they would not live without the advantages of the public Ministry and Worship, they invite such to take the Pastoral care of their Souls as are duly qualified; that such qualified persons should not accept *Ordination* on such wicked terms, is past doubt; But what if they live so remote from any other *Christian Kingdom* that they cannot have *Ministerial Ordination* elsewhere. Will any say, that in this case, those qualified persons for want of this *Ordination* ought not to take on them the *Pastoral charge* of those people, which God has given them such abilities for, and such a *Call* by his providence to? To say this, were to set up the Rule about the regular ordering the Ministry above the *ends* of the Ministry it self, and oppose the *circumstances* of the Duty to the *substance* of it. Whereas *positive* precepts must always yield to *moral*, and matters of *order* to the *end* of the Duty ordered; and the *former* must never be pleaded against the *latter*. *Ordination* by Pastors is not therefore there necessary where it cannot be had without sin; and yet without a Ministry; the interest of the Gospel, and the salvation of Souls, are like to suffer the most visible prejudice and detriment. For these are matters infinitely more precious and valuable than any Rules of external order, and the very end those Rules aim at, and are subservient to. And if this be not granted, it must be left to the pleasure of such corrupt Pastors, whether the people who cannot joyn in communion with them, shall enjoy the means of their salvation, or be obliged to live like Atheists without any public worship of God. And he that asserts this, may next assert, that God has left it to their pleasure, whether the people shall be saved or damn'd; and that 'tis better they should be *canonically* damn'd than *uncanonically* sav'd. I propose these Cases to shew the vanity and falsehood of that Notion some make such a noise about, *viz: The necessity of an uninterrupted succession of Ordination*. And if

if that principle be false; much more is theirs who assert the necessity of Successive prelatical ordination.

But tho in such extraordinary Cases, The extraordinary call of God's providence is sufficient to authorize a man to the sacred office, and supplies the defect of Ministerial Ordination; Yet the command of God which enjoyns such Ordination does oblige where it may be had; and the neglect of it wou'd bring great confusion and disorder into the Church, and expose it to the danger of being corrupted and divided by *unqualified Intruders*.

The only thing that remains to be consider'd under this Head is, *Who are entrusted with the power of ordination*, Or whom has Christ appointed to approve and invest others in the Ministerial office?

Ans^r. Those are entrusted with this power and appointed to this work, Who are themselves such *Bishops* or *Elders* or *Pastors* as the holy Scriptures describe, He that denies this, is oblig'd to acquaint us what other Officers the Apostles left in the Church, to whom this sole power of ordination was entrusted then, or what other officers claimed and exercised it in the primitive Church, Which none that I know of ever pretended to do.

But now those whom the holy Scriptures call Bishops or Elders, were the stated pastors of particular Congregations.

That the same persons are in Scripture call'd Bishops and Elders is too palpable to be denied (However the Authors of the Preface to the Book of Ordination are pleased to say the contrary, viz. *That 'tis evident to all men diligently reading the holy Scriptures and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles time there have been these orders in Christs Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons*, (as several offices) and even this palpable mistake among the rest we are required to declare our assent to.) Those who are 20 *Acts*. 17. called the *Elders* of the Church of *Ephesus*, are commanded, *v*. 28. to take heed to all the flock, over whom the holy Ghost had made them *overseers* or *Bishops*. The description of a *Bishop* 1 *Tim*. 3 *ch*. and of an *Elder* 1 *Tim*. are the same; And *Titus* when directed to ordain *Elders* must

see that they be blameless, for a *Bishop* must be blameless as the Steward of God, v. 6, 7.

That these *Bishops* or *Elders* were Pastors of single congregations is evident from the *Duties* enjoined them towards those under their care, and from the *Duties* which the Flocks are required to pay them.

They are to labour among the people and admonish them, And the people were to know and esteem them highly in love for their works sake 1 Thess. 5, 12, 13. They were to rule their Flock, speak the word of God to them, and to watch over their Souls as those that must give an account; 13 Hebr. 7, 17, 24. They were to take heed to all the Flock over whom the Holy Ghost had made them overseers. 20 Acts, 28. Wherein the Apostle proposes his own practice, (while he stay'd among them as their temporary pastor) for their imitation viz That he taught them publickly, and from house to house, and ceased not to warn every one with tears day and night 20 Acts, 20, 31. v. They were to be ensamples to the Flock who were to follow their Faith considering the end of their Conversation, 1 Pet. 5, v. 3, compar'd with Heb: 13. 7. They were to visit the sick and pray for them James, 5, 14. see Dr. Hammond's Annotations on these places applying them to Bishops.

Now let us consider whether these mutual duties, betwixt Pastor and Flock were to be performed betwixt the Pastor or Pastors of a single congregation, and the congregation committed to their care or betwixt a *Diocesan* Bishop and so vast a Flock as his *Diocess*.

That one or more Pastors of a single congregation associated for personall communion are capable of performing these duties to their Flock, and their Flock to them is past all doubt.

But can these mutual Duties be performed betwixt a *Diocesan* Bishop and his *Diocess*? Is he capable of labouring amongst them in word, and being esteemed of them highly for his works sake, when very few, comparatively of his *Diocess*, ever saw him, or heard him preach? Can he watch over the souls of all his *Diocess* as his Flock, and warn them of their evil courses, when he knows not one of them in many score thousands.

Can the Diocess follow the Faith of such Bishops, and consider the end of their conversation, and propose them as their patterns, when not one in many thousands know any more of the life of their Bishop, than if he lived at the other end of the World? Are such Bishops obliged to visit the sick of their Diocess? Can they rule them by the exercise of Church-discipline against the notoriously scandalous, when perhaps there are forty or fifty thousand such in their Diocess? Can they use all the due process of serious reproofs and perswasions that are requisite to be used for reclaiming such sinners, when there is so vast a number of them, and those so remote in their habitations, and the Bishops wholly strangers to the most of them? These are so palpable impossibilities, as to an unbiass'd considerer, are instead of a thousand Arguments; that the Bishops or Elders which these Texts speak of were not *Diocesan Bishops*, i. e. they were not the Overseers or Rulers of many score or hundreds of Churches, as their Flocks to whom they were to perform all these Pastoral works, and the Flocks to pay them the forementioned Duties; But the Pastors of such a number of people as they could thus personally *oversee, teach, rule, watch over, visit, &c.* and such a number as could pay them that *love, submission, imitation, &c.* prescrib'd in the forequoted Texts. Especially when 'tis so expressly asserted. *Acts 14. v. 23. That such Elders were ordained in every Church, which Titus is also appointed to do in every City, 1 Tit. 5.* And 'tis well known every Town equal to our usual Market-Towns in England was then called *polis*, or *City*; and but a few comparatively of the inhabitants at first converted to Christianity.

I grant, that soon after the Apostles time, the name of Bishop and Presbyter, or Elder, begun to be distinguish'd, and that of Bishop apply'd to a stated Præses or Moderator of a Presbytery or certain number of Elders. But 'tis as evident, That the Bishop and his Presbyters in the Primitive Church were but the Rulers of one *Single* Congregation capable of personal communion, not of many *Score or hundred* Churches. How plain to this purpose is that known passage of *Ignatius* (whose Authority the Defenders of Prelates have so vainly boasted of.)

who in his Epistle to the *Philadelphians* gives this certain mark of every Churches individuation, viz. *There is to every Church one Altar and one Bishop together with the Presbytery (or Eldership) and the Deacons my fellow servants.* The same Author in his Epistle to *Polycarp* advises that good Bishop to have frequent Church-Assemblies, and to enquire after all by name, and not to despise servants and maids: So in his Epistle to the *Smyrnenses*, Follow all of you the Bishop as Jesus Christ does the Father, and the Presbytery as the Apostles, and reverence the Deacons as the appointment of God. Let none without the Bishop transact the affairs of the Church. Let that be accounted a valid communion which is in his presence, or by his permission; for where the Bishop is, there let the multitude be. 'Tis not lawful, without the Bishop, to Baptize, or make a Love-Feast.

Nothing can more fully evidence that the Church of *Smyrna* had their Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons; and 'twere ridiculous to apply these passages to a modern Bishop and his Diocess.

Justin Martyr's known account of Church-Assemblies evinces the truth of this which the learned Mr. *Jos. Mede* in his *Discourse of Churches* quotes, p. 48, 49, 50. and from thence acknowledges, *They had then but one Altar, (or place of Communion) to a Church, taken for the company or corporation of the faithful, as united under one Bishop.*

Tertullian's account of particular Church-assemblies assures us, that Church-discipline was exercis'd in them, and that by the *probati seniores*, or approved Elders (among whom we own the *Preses* was called Bishop). Even in *Cyprian's* time, his famous Church of *Carthage* was not so great, but that he frequently professes he would do nothing in Church-affairs without the consent of his Presbyters, and all the people, especially in the censuring of Offenders. As in his *Ep. 3. 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 26, 27, 28, &c.* Edit. Goul. And *Ep. 68.* as he there declares the people have the chiefest power of choosing worthy Priests, and refusing the unworthy; so when he relates the manner of the Ordination of a Bishop, he tells us, *All the next Bishops of the same Province do come together to that* people

people over whom the Bishop is set, and the Bishop is appointed, the people being present who fullest know the life of every one, and have thoroughly seen the Act of every one's conversation. Which also we saw done with you in the Ordination of Sabinus our Colleague, that the office of a Bishop was given him, and hands imposed on him in the place of Basilides by the suffrage of the whole Fraternity, and by the judgment of the Bishops that had met together, &c.

We may easily gather what the Bishops Church was when all the people must be present, and judge of his life, and are supposed to be thoroughly acquainted with it. A Diocess of the modern extent would be hard put to it to meet together for this purpose, and pass their judgment concerning the life of their Bishop.

The *Constitutions and Canons* called *Apostolical*, assign such duties to the Bishop, as plainly imply his relation to a Congregation capable of personal Communion, as his Charge or Flock.

And (to give a brief summary of those proofs which it would require a large volume to insist fully on) if we consider impartially all the duties which the most ancient Christian Writers describe, as belonging to the office of a Bishop, viz. [To be the ordinary publick Teacher of his Flock, (a) and Baptizer of those that were received into his Church. (b) To confirm the Baptized, to reconcile and absolve all penitents, to administer the Lords Supper. (c) To receive all oblations, &c. and distribute them. To take care of the poor and sick and strangers as their Overseer and Curator (d) To try all causes about scandal in his Church with his *Presbyters* in the presence of his Flock (e) To Ordain other Bishops and Elders, To keep Synods among his neighbour Bishops, To grant communicatory Letters (f) &c.] And to how great a flock one man is capable to perform them: If we consider further that the Bishop and his *Presbyters* liv'd usually in the same House and in Common, at least near the Church, and that in the distribution of their maintenance one half of it was destin'd to repair the Fabrick or Temple, and maintain the poor; the other half to the Bishop and his Clergy,

or Presbyters (g); That it was the common custom for the Presbyters to sit in the same Seat with the Bishop (in a semicircle) and the Deacons below them (h); That the Deacons are always mentioned as Officers in the same Church with the Bishop (i). That the Love-feasts were not to be kept without the Bishops permission, and he was to have his share sent him, if absent (k). That the way of strangers communicating was by communicatory Letters or Certificates which were to be shewed to the Bishop of the Church where they desir'd to communicate (l). That a Schism was describ'd by setting up Altars against Altar, every communicating Church having its Altar (or Table for celebrating the Lords Supper) and Bishop (m)

(a) *Constit. Apost.* c. 26. *Iust. Mart. Apol.* 2. (b) *Tertull. de Cor. Mil.* c. 3. (c) *Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn.* p. 4. *Iust. Mart. Apol.* 2. (d) *Iust. Mart. ibid. Constit. Apost.* c. 27. *Apost. Can.* 5. (e) See *Cypr. Ep. passim*, *Tertull. Apol.* c. 39. and many more in *Blondel de Jure plebis*, &c. (f) See *Albasp. Observ.* p. 254, 255. (g) See *Tolet de sacerdot. lib.* 5. cap. 4. n. 15. and *Pad. Paul Sarrpi's* Tract of Church-benefices translated by Dr. Denton. (h) *Constit. Apost.* c. 57. *Counc. Carth.* 4. *Can.* 35 (i) 1 *Phil. v. r. Clem. Rom. Ep. ad Cor.* p. 54, 55: *Pius in Ep. Justo Episc. Biblioth. Patr. Tom.* 3. p. 15. *Constit. Apost.* c. 30 & 44. (k) *Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn.* forequoted. *Constit. Apost.* c. 28. (l) *Albasp. Observ.* p. 254, 255. (m) *Ignat. Ep. ad Philad.* forecited. *Cypr. Ep.* 40, 72, 73. The ancient description of a Church is well known, *Plebs Episcopo coadunata*: See Dr. *Still. Iren.* p. 416.

That the Bishop was chosen by the Suffrages or Votes of the people he took the charge of, (n) and (as was said before) administred Church-censures in the presence of his Flock, whose judgment he consulted (o:) That Presbyters did but seldom preach publicly in the two or three first Ages, except in Alexandria or some few Churches that had Presbyters of more than ordinary Learning and Abilities; Chrysostom's preaching at Antioch, and Austin's at Hippo, while Presbyters are noted as unusual; That every City had its Bishop, is granted by all; (and Dr. Hammond and Grovius own many had two, nay, some had

had more, as might appear by many instances, were it needful.) And every Town of any bigness was then called *polis*, or City, and the number of Christians did not of a long time even in the larger Cities exceed that of our larger Parishes. Nor were Bishops confin'd to Cities or Towns; for the Countrey Villages (where there were any tolerable number of Christians to make a Church or Congregation) had long their Bishops also, who were not put down till Ambition had begun to deprave the Church, and for a reason agreeable to the humour of those that did it, *ne vilescat nomen Episcopi* (p): If we consider the nearness of Episcopal See's of which we read many that were much nearer one another than our Market-Towns, perhaps one, two, or a few more miles distant (q): If we observe all the small inconsiderable places that were the See's of many famous ancient Bishops, not half so big as our lesser sort of Parishes (r): If we consider the vast number of Bishops mentioned within a narrow compass of ground.

(v) See *Cypr. Ep.* 68 forecited, and many more testimonies in *Baxter's Church-History*, & Answer to *Stillingsfl.* from p. 128 to 133. and in *Blondel de Jure plebis*, &c. (o) See *Blondel*, *ibid* (p) *Concil. Laod. Can.* 57. (q) To give a few instances; In *Palestine*, *Diespolis* or *Lydda* was but six miles from *Joppa*, *Joppa* four miles from *Janmia*; *Rhinocorua* four miles from *Anthedon*, and *Anthedon* not three miles from *Gaza*, and *Gaza* twenty furlongs from *Constantia* (anciently called *Majuma*). So in *Egypt*, *Nicopolis* was twenty furlongs from *Alexandria*, and *Taposiris*, *Canopus*, *Heraclia* and *Naucratis* not much farther from one another; and yet all these Episcopal See's (r). Mr. *Thorn-dike Right of Churches reviewed*, tells us, p. 53. that in *Africa* Bishops were so plentiful, that every good Village must needs be the Seat of an Episcopal Church; and the *African Church*, as Dr. *Stillingsfleet* tells us, *Iren.* p. 373. longest retain'd the primitive simplicity and humility.

Binnius tells us of *Sylvester* calling together 284 Bishops, of which 139 were out of *Rome*, or not far from it. A Council of *Donatists* at *Carthage* had 270 Bishops (as *Austin* tells us, *Ep.* 68) about the year 308, and yet they were the smaller number, and com-

complain'd of Persecution. *Victor. Utic: in Persets Vand.* acquaints us that in that part of *Africa* 660 Bishops fled besides the great number murdered and imprisoned and many tolerated, The 6th Provincial Council of *Carthage* had 217 Bishops. And to give an instance of later date which we are more capable to judge of, even *Patrick* is said to have founded here in *Ireland* 365 Churches, ordain'd so many Bishops besides 3000 Presbyters. *Usher de Ecclesi: Brit. Primord.* p. 950. If we add hereto the late date of Parishes as distinguished from the Bishops Church, (The Government of the Cathedrall by the Bishop with the Dean, and chapters being a Relict of the ancient Episcopal Government) From these evidencies (and many more might be added) duly weigh'd, Wee may easily judge what the ancient Churches and Bishops were. A primitive Bishop had no more then one Church, or assembly capable of personal Communion under his Charge, which he rul'd with the joynt concurrence of his *Presbyters* or *Elders*. The first that set up more Assemblies under one Bishop were *Rome* and *Alexandria*, and no other Church can be prov'd to have done so for near 300 years nor many Churches for 4 or 5 hundred. And even those Assemblies did but long make up one communicating Church, and were but to the Bishops Church as Chappels of ease are to our larger Parish Churches. But for Diocesan Churches and Bishops, 'tis evident from these few remarks, That they are entire strangers to the primitive Church in its first and purest Ages. 'Twas only Ambition (striving to modell the Ecclesiastical Government by the Civil) that first gave rise to them, and from the same ambition in the Empire, sprung up *Metropolitans*, *Patriarchs* and *Popes*, (The last of these long claiming only a Primacy of order among the rest of the Bishops in the Empire, for which *Constantinople* long vy'd with them, 'tis but of late they have improv'd their pretensions into a claim of Supremacy over the Catholick Church as the *Vicars* of Christ) And 'tis too observable in Church History that as the Seats of Bishops swell'd and their power encreast by engrossing to themselves that work which a score or hundred Bishops cou'd hardly discharge, so all true Discipline was gradually diffus'd

us'd and lost, and the Church miserably deprav'd by the corruption of it, as well as divided by the Contentions of aspiring Bishops about their primacy and usurped power.

If you desire further satisfaction on this head, I referr you to *Mr. Baxters Treatise of Episcopacy* who in the 2^d. part 5, 6, 7: *et*. has given as Satisfactory an account of the ancient Episcopacy as can be expected of any matter of fact at that distance. The few slender exceptions produc't by *Dr. Stillingfl.* in his *Unreason. of Seper.* (which yet do not reach the two first Centuries) are so clearly invalidated and expos'd by *Mr. Baxters Answer to Dr. St. p. 100, 101, &c.* and by *Mr. Clerkson* in his, *No evidence of Diocesan Churches in Antiq: &c.* that I shall take it for granted that, *Diocesan Bishops and Churches are Strangers to Antiquity*, and shall look on that cause as desperate and lost, unless some of its *Patrons* cou'd disprove that full stream of evidence he has brought against it from the most ancient Christian writers in the foremention'd Treatise. There are few considerable defenders of Prelacy, whose writings he has not animadverted on.

And tis strange to observe, how farr the most of them mistake the true state of the controversie. Some go about to prove a sort of general superintendents Arch-Bishops, or Metropolitans who had some inspection over the Bishops of particular Churches within their Province, and presided in their Synods, but did not put down the Government and exercise of Church-Discipline in those particular Churches, as if this were a proof of those *Diocesan Bishops* that do cast out all Government and exercise of Discipline by the Bishops or Pastors of particular Churches, and pretend to be the sole Pastors of the Diocess. And yet the jurisdiction of such *Metropolitans*, is of no very ancient date, and quite contrary to the judgment of *Cyprian*, who disowns any *Bishop of Bishops*, and owns only Bishops or Overseers of Flocks or Churches. Others take a great deal of pains to prove the stated presidency of one (by the name of *Bishop*) in a *Confessus* or Bench of *Presbyters*, who had but all one Communicating Church under their charge, which is not deny'd to have begun early in the Church as a Remedy of

Schism.

Schism. But that difference of *Bishop* and *Presbyters*, when both were but joynt rulers of a Congregation, is so far from being a proof of modern prelacy; that such *Diocesan Bishops* have put down the primitive Parish-Bishops, and monopoliz'd the power of many score, or hundreds of such Bishops to themselves, and thereby rendred true Church-government impracticable. Nay that very difference betwixt the *Bishop* and *Presbyters* of a particular Church, seems to have had it's rise wholly in the notorious disparity of his gifts, learning, age, &c. above the rest, but was never esteemed by them a difference in office or power, nor is it ascrib'd to any higher Original then Human Constitution by *Jerome, Austin, Ambrose, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, &c.* not to mention Elder writers.

If then Ordination belong to Scripturall Bishops, and such be the Pastors of particular Churches, If none else did ordain in the Primitive Church in its purest Ages Then all such Bishops have that power. Nor indeed have any power to ordain, but on the account of their being such Scriptural Bishops. The office of *Diocesan Prelates* being a manifest Usurpation in the Church which had it's rise in human Ambition, That Usurpation cannot rightfully deprive the true Bishops or Pastors of that power of Church-government, which is as essential to their office as the power of teaching or being guides in worship. And whatever may be said for Parish-Bishops, submitting for peace sake, to the usurpation of a *Diocesan*, (*ex: gr.* when he claims the sole power of Ordination) where the true ends of it are attain'd, yet they have no reason to submit to it, when *Diocesan Bishops* shall so abuse that usurped power as to corrupt and deprave the Ministry by imposing sinful terms, and hazard the ruin of Souls by neglecting to provide a number of faithful Pastors suitable to their real necessities. The Ordination therefore of the Pastors or Bishops of particular Churches is more agreeable to the holy Scripture and primitive Antiquity, and consequently more unexceptionably *Valid* then that of a single *Diocesan*.

• From whence it follows, That the *ordination* of Pastors in the Presbyterian Churches is *Valid*; because either they are ordain'd

ordain'd by *Diocesan* Bishops, who had power to ordain on the account of that office they have in common with *scriptural* Bishops, tho they have none as *Diocesan*; or they are ordain'd by a concurrence of *scriptural* Bishops, to whose office the power of *Ordination* was annext by *divine* Institution, and cannot be alienated by any *humane* usurpation. For Christ has given none power to change his Institutions. Nor can the *will* of the Ordainers debar his Officers from any part of that Authority which his *Charter* conveys to them. And if the validity of *Ordination* by such *scriptural* Bishops be deny'd, the *Church* had no ordained Ministers for a *Century* or two at least.

Having laid down these Notions about *Mission*, I come to examine D: M's Quest's.

Quest: 1: *What priesthood or holy Orders had the first Reformers, but what they received from the hands of Roman-Catholick Bishops?*

Ans: If D: M: mean, that their *priesthood* or ministerial office was convey'd to them by the Bishops, as the *Givers* of it, they receiv'd it from none at all; nor has any that power to give; 'tis given by Christ in his Charter: But if he mean, that the Roman Catholick, or Popish Bishops did invest them in that office: 'Tis own'd, that most of the Reformed Ministers were ordain'd by them; and 'tis not material, whether they were Roman Catholick Bishops of the same rigid stamp as those of the present Age, or no; for the validity of their *Ordination* depends on the *Essentials* of the Pastoral office retain'd, and not on their horrid corruption of it. And as Mr. A. well observes, they ordain'd as *Christian*, not as *Roman* Bishops. But what if some of the Reformers became Pastors to the people upon their necessities and call, who durst not comply with the sinful terms of *Ordination* in the Church of *Rome*, and yet could have no other? They would not be in this case destitute of a true *Mission*: For the evident necessities of the peoples souls (who earnestly desir'd to have the Truths of the Gospel purely preach'd, and divine Worship purely celebrated; and who could not with a safe conscience continue in the Communion of the

Roman

Roman Church), and their Qualifications for so necessary a work were a sufficient *signification* of the will of Christ that they should undertake it. For the precept about the ordinary regular way of Admission to the Ministry did not oblige where it cou'd not belawfully observed and where there was a far greater necessity of a pure untainted Ministry then of that positive point of Order. For else on supposition, no Pastors had embraced the Reformation, The people who did, woud have been obliged to have lived like *Atheists* without publick worship.

2 Q: *Who authorized the first Reformers to preach their Protestant Doctrine, and administer their Protestant Sacraments?*

Ans. It does not belong to the Ordainers to determine what Doctrine the person ordained shall preach, but to Christ who has determined that matter already. And therefore if the Doctrine which our first Reformers preachd, and the Sacraments they administred be *Christ's*, as Mr. K. well argues, 'tis ridiculous to ask who authoriz'd them to preach the one, or administer the other. *Christ did*; and no men can authorize any to preach any *other* Doctrine, or administer any *other* Sacraments. The Bishops or Priests in the *Roman Church* had no right or *Mission* from Christ to preach *Popish* Doctrine, or administer *Popish* Sacraments, or celebrate *Popish* Worship so far as these are contrary to the Doctrine, Sacraments, and Worship contain'd in the Gospel. These were gross *corruptions* of their office; and therefore when any of them embrac'd the Reformation, when they begun to preach the Gospel more purely, and to celebrate divine Worship more free from the idatrous and superstitious mixtures that had prevail'd in the *Roman Church*, they restor'd their Ministry to its true use, and so far surg'd it from that wretched *depravation*. And in this debate Mr. K. need not be asham'd to defend either *Luth.*, or *Calvin*, or *Zuinglius*. For *Socinus* or his followers, they can produce no *Mission* to preach against the *Divinity* and *Satisfaction* of the Son of God, no more than D. M. to preach up the worship of *Images*, or *Invocation* of *Angels* and *Saints*, or *Adoration* of the *Host*, &c.

For the 3^d and 4th Qu. I shall joyn them.
 Whether Cranmer and his Associates could condemn the Church
 of Rome by pretence of the Mission they received from her Bi-
 shops. If so, whether a Presbyterian Minister having received
 Orders from a Protestant B^{sh}p, can by vertue of such Orders
 pronounce the Church of Eng^l and a corrupt Church.

It is evident both these Questions are founded on this ridi-
 culous fancy, that the person Ordained is obliged to conform
 his Ministrations to the judgment or humour of the Ordainers.

It is true indeed, if in any Church, the Ministers that are Or-
 dained be obliged to subscribe a Confession of Faith, or observe
 any publick Rules in their Worship, they ought not to be Or-
 dain'd on these terms, if they think any thing in the Doctrine
 of that Church, or the Rules of its worship contrary to the
 Doctrine of Christ, or the Gospel Rule of Worship. Much
 less should they enter into that obligation with a design to
 break it afterwards. This were odious dissimulation. But if
 any have been Ordain'd in a Church that has obliged them to
 subscribe certain Articles of Faith, and Rules of Worship, which
 at their Ordination they had no scruple against, and shall upon
 deeper study find many of those Articles were gross and dan-
 gerous Errors, and those Rules of Worship idolatrous or su-
 perstitious, they are not obliged to preach those Errors, or pra-
 ctice those Rules against the dictates of their own conscience.
 Nay, if those errors and corruptions endanger the salvation of
 their Flock, they ought to preach against them, and warn souls
 of their danger. And not to do this, is to betray those souls,
 to desert the cause and testimony of Christ, and fail of that
 fidelity he expects in the discharge of their office. They ought
 to do all in their sphere towards a Reformation; and if they
 should be suspended for the doing that which Christ has made
 their duty, the suspension is unjust and null, as being opposite to
 the laws and interest of Christ, and is indeed a Rebellion against
 him. If therefore the Doctrines and Worship of the Roman
 Church were pernicious, and endangered the salvation of souls,
 and our Reformers had just ground to account them such, they
 were bound by the laws of Christ to preach against them, and

warn

warn the people of them, and in their *sphere*, attempt a Reformation. Nor would any *suspension* or *excommunication* of those Popish Bishops that *Ordain'd* them, justify their deserting their Ministry, and betraying the interest of *Christ* and *souls*. And they might do this without assuming any *Authority* over the Church of *Rome*; they only refused *subjection* to her unjust *impositions*. And so may *Presbyterian* Ministers refuse *subjection* to the *sinful impositions* of those *Prelates* that *Ordain'd* them, and are not obliged to lay down their Office when ever their *Ordainers* shall unjustly silence them, as we proved before.

But Mr. K. I perceive likes not this Answer, and therefore chooses to justify the Church of *Engl* upon narrower grounds; And therefore in his Reply to these Questions;

1. He grants that, *A Presbyter or Bishop ought not to preach against the Constitution of the Church whereof they are Members.*

2. He asserts, *This was not the Reformers Case*, and therefore he founds the lawfulness of the Reformation entirely upon its being made by the *Convocation*, in whom he supposes the *supreme Church-Government* lodged in this Nation.

Had Mr. K. only argued, that the Reformation in *England* was not only *lawful*, but effected in the most *regular* way with the concurrence of the Civil Magistrate upon the advice of so considerable a part of the Clergy; none could have blam'd him for taking in all the considerations that prove the Reformation in *England* to have been the most unexceptionably regular and orderly. But that in his eager zeal to defend the *Prelates* of the Church of *England* in silencing their brethren, he should make such a *Concession* to the *Papists* as may be used against the Reformation else where with so great advantage, was not *ingenuous*. But we must excuse him that he had rather wound the *Reformed Churches* abroad, than not gratify his spleen against the *Presbyterians* at home; and call'd not whom he made *Schismatics*, provided he fastned that character on his *Brethren*.

Let us therefore examine this *Concession* of his, p. 27. *A Presbyter or Bishop ought not to preach against the Constitution*

of that Church of which they are members. The reason he gives is, *Because there is a regular way wherein they may endeavour a Reformation, viz. If they find any thing amiss in her Doctrine or Discipline, they may make their application for the redress of it to those that have power to reform it, but must not presume, being subjects, to usurp their Governors power.*

But what if their Governors refuse to reform, and silence those that desire, or in their own sphere attempt it? All the answer is,

But if such a Bishop or Presbyter be censur'd and suspended, he is thereby discharg'd from the execution of his Office, and he must no more make a Schism to regain it, than one must make a Rebellion in the State to regain a Civil Office. This we urge, and I think with reason against the Presbyterians and other Sects among us, that either have no Ordination or appointment to their Offices from the Church of England or Ireland, or else abuse the power against her, which was once given them by her, and from which they are again legally suspended. And as we urge this against them, so likewise against D. M. &c.

Let us briefly consider the Consequences of this Concession, and the grounds of it.

1. Its Consequences.

The first Protestant Pastors in France, and most other parts of Europe were before the Reformation members of those Churches where they lived, and subject to their Governors; they had received Ordination by the hands of Popish Prelates. God was pleased so to bless their studies, and search after truth, that they begun to discover abundance of gross and pernicious errors in the Doctrine, and a wretched mixture of Idolatry and Superstition in the worship of the Church they lived in. What should they do? they were but particular Presbyters, and therefore should not according to Mr. K's principle preach against the Constitution of the Church which gave them their Office. Many of them try'd his remedy; they represented these things to their Ecclesiastical Superiors, as Luther to the Archbishop of Mentz, and the Bishop of Brandenburg, and the Pope himself. But they soon learnt by dear experience, how averse the Court

of

of *Rome* was to any Reformation, and how little it was to be expected from the *Prelates*, who either had no will, or no courage to attempt a Reformation against the will of the Pope. *Luther* and all his followers in stead of prevailing with those that had the conduct of the Church were excommunicated as *Hereticks*. Now according to Mr. K's principle, these Reformers being censured and suspended by the *Prelates* to whom they were subject, were discharged from the execution of their Office, and should no more have made a Schism in the Church to regain it, than one must make a Rebellion in the State to regain a Civil Office.. And since they did not desert their Office, but went on to preach against the Constitution of the *Romish Church*, and the will of their Superiors the *Popish Prelates*, they were no better than *Schismatics* and *Church-Rebels*; Nay, if his Notion of the *Catholick Church* be true, the people that separated from the *Popish Prelates*, and adher'd to their excommunicated Pastors, cease to be members of the body of Christ. And how great a part of the Reformed Churches and their Pastors fall under this heavy charge? And will Mr. K. own all these unavoidable consequences upon mature deliberation? What if we shou'd once more have a *Popish Convocation* in *England*, and these should restore the *Romish Religion*, and suspend all the present *Parish-Ministers* (whom Mr. K. thinks now lawful Pastors), According to his Principle they being but *Presbyters*, and the *Bishops Subjects*, must not preach against the Constitution of the Church of *England*, declaring her judgment by a Convocation in whom the *supreme Government of the Church* is lodg'd; they must therefore cease their Ministry, and no more make a Schism by the exercise of it, than they must make a Rebellion in the State to regain a Civil Office. Nay, to separate from such Governors of the Church of *England*, will prove those that do it no *Catholick members of the Church*. The same principles may be apply'd to the *Arrians*, who got Imperial Councils, and consequently the Government of the Imperial Church into their hands, and for such Pastors as *Athanasius* to preach against *Arrianism* which was then the Doctrine of the Church was *Schism* and *Church-Rebellion*; In a word, Accord-

daig

ding to these Principles, 'Tis in the power of a *Convocation* to damn many thousand souls by *suspending* an Orthodox, and *substituting* a corrupt Ministry; and for those Orthodox Pastors when *suspended* to endeavour their salvation by the exercise of their Ministry, is to be *Schismatics* and *Church Rebels*. And what is this less than to set up the *will* of such *Church-Governors* above the *will* and *laws* of *Christ*, above the *Salvation* of *Souls*, and above the *Interest* of *Truth* and *Holiness*. Therefore,

3. Let us examine the *Grounds* of this strange Assertion, viz. *Because there is a regular way for reforming abuses, And for particular Presbyters to do it against the will of the Bishops whose Subjects they are, is like reforming abuses in the state, in spite of the King, a remedy generally worse then the disease, &c.*

Ans. 1. All that these reasons prove is, that Reformation shou'd be first sought by humble addressing to our Superiors. But Mr K plainly leaves it impossible if they refuse.

2. They are founded on this wretched mistake, that the Authority of *Bishops* in the *Church* does resemble that of a *King* in the *State*, and so to reform abuses in the *Church* against their will, is like reforming abuses in the *State*, in spite of the *King*. Whereas tis *Christ's* Authority in the *Church* that does resemble the *King's* in the *State*. And therefore if he wou'd rightly state the comparison, it runs thus; *Christ* the *King* of his *Church*, requires all his *Officers* to preach the pure Doctrine and administer the pure institutions deliver'd in his Gospel (which is his universal law,) Let us suppose, there are in this or that particular part of the *Church* dangerous corruptions crept in, The law of *Christ* obliges these his officers to disown them and reform them, but the Major part of these will not, but presume to silence those that do it according to his command Now the *Quest*: is whether those that obey the command of *Christ* be the *Rebells* against him, or those that neither will obey his commands themselves, nor allow others to do so. One wou'd think, that such as refuse to reform and silence all that in their own place attempt it, according to the tenour of their *Commission*, are like to prove the *Church Rebels*. But no doubt

doubt the Pastors of a Church may disown and excommunicate one that abuses his office to the perverting the Church, and for him to continue to pervert the Church by such *male-administration* is to *Rebell* against Christ and his laws. The charge of *Rebellion* therefore must arise from the violation of *Christ's* Authority, not mens, which the *Major* part of Pastors may be guilty of in a Nation as well as the less.

3 He seems to confound a *private* and a *public* Reformation.

4. The Reason given, why a Bishop or Presbyter when censur'd, is discharged from his Office, *viz. Because to regain it is like making a Rebellion to regain a Civil Office* does suppose two great mistakes.

1. That the *Ordainers* give a *Spiritual* office in the Church as the *King* gives a *Civil* office in the State; And this is no less a mistake then to set the *Ordainers* in the place of *Christ*. Tis his Charter gives the *sacred* office as the *King's* does the *Civil*, and the *Ordainers* do but for orders sake approve, and ceremonially invest the person as the *Recorder* does the *Mayor* of a *Town* whom the *Burghesses* choose. And herein Mr. K seems to own that very error which is the ground of all Mr. M's impertinent Questions.

2. He supposes, that the *Bishops* who ordain *Presbyters*, have equal power to depose them from their *Ministerial* office as the *King* has to take away a *Civill Commission*. And thus, p: 27, he tells us, *That the present Dissenters were the Bishops subjects, accountable to them as their Superiors, and liable to be discharged from their office, and the benefits of the Communion of the Church by their Censure.*

Whereas Tis plain, that it is the Charter of *Christ* gives the *sacred* office as the *King's* does the *Civil*; And as none can take a *Civil Commission* given by the *King* to any Subject, but by the *King's orders and command*; So none can take away that *spiritual* Commission *Christ* has given any officer in his Church but by his orders. But now he has given none leave or Authority to depose his officers, but for evident *Male-administration*, as *preaching Heresie, gross scandal, &c.* And if in any part of his Church,

Church, The *Major* number of Pastors shou'd depose the *Minor* for doing their duty, or without a just cause, their doing so is, a bold and wicked usurpation, for which they may expect their Lord will call them to an account, as he threatens the *evil servant, who unmindfull of his Lord's coming, begun to smite his fellow servants*, 24. *Matth.* 48, 49: But for the innocent Pastors thus wrongfully deposed, to disobey their usurping deposers is to obey Christ, who never warranted them to desert their office, and betray Souls, because they are unjustly forbidden to do what his charter has made their duty. 'Tis therefore the *unjust deposers* are the *Rebells* against Christ, and their *usurpation* is, as if the *Mayor of a County town* shou'd without any orders from the King, presume to turn out all the *Mayors* of the *particular Corporations* in that *County* at his own pleasure; and I imagine the *King* wou'd in all probability take him for the *Rebell* who wou'd thus under pretence of his Authority, usurp a power never given him, and exercise it to the violation of his Charter, and the Laws of the Land. This is the true state of the Case, and Mr. *K's* mistakes about it are so palpable, that 'tis a wonder how a man of his judgment cou'd fall into them. And I must needs add here, that as the *Dissenters* were never the Bishops *Subjects* as they are any officers of *Christ*, and Mr. *K* will never prove them to be so; So they will be more afraid of submitting to their *usurpation*, if they arrogate to themselves such an unlimited power of deposing his undoubted officers, particular, Church Bishops, and claim a blind obedience to their deposing Sentence, be it right or wrong. And 'tis but fidelity to our Lord, to disown such palpable and dangerous usurpation.

The grounds then of Mr. *K's* principles being false, they will not serve him to condemn the *Presbyterian* Ministers as either *Schismaticks* or *Church-Rebels*, and the charge is likelier to fall heavy on those that presum'd to suspend them against the known laws of Christ, from whom they received their Commission. Mr. *K.* very gravely takes for granted, what he will never prove.

1. That the Convocation are by the laws of Christ, the Supreme

preme Governours of all the Christians in England.

2. *That either the Convocation did justly, according to the laws of Christ, suspend the Nonconforming Ministers, or that an absolute obedience, was due to their Censure whether just or unjust.*

1. He takes it for granted, *That the Convocation, are by the Laws of Christ, the supreme Governours of all the Christians in England.*

Does not Mr. K. know, that the *Divines* of his own Church are not agreed about this matter. The Reverend Dr. Stilling: when posed by Mr. Baxter about this Quest. *Who*

was the Ecclesiastical governing Head of the Church of England, as one body politick, does very fairly deny that the Church of England has any such *Head*

Ureas: of
Seper: p:
127, 128.

or *Regent part*, nay denies the necessity of such an *Head*. So that according to him, the Church of England can be no *Politick Church* made up of a *Governing* and a *governed part*; And consequently all the noise of it's *Government Constitutions and Laws* as such a *politick Church*, is at an end. But now Mr. K. comes and tells us without Scruple, *That the supreme Government of our Church, has always been in a National Council or convocation of our Clergy*. If so, I wou'd gladly know, whether Mr. K: does think that the laws or Canons of a Convocation, wou'd oblige the Consciences of all the Christians in England, tho they were not enacted and ratified by the civil Authority? If they wou'd nor, 'tis evident, that the Church of England has no *Ecclesiastical Head of Government*, because none that can make laws obligatory to all the Christians in England; And so the Convocation are but the *King's Ecclesiastical Council* (which is indeed the true Notion of them) to advise him what Laws he shall establish by civil Authority, relating to Church Government. If he say, the Canons of the Convocation wou'd oblige, whether the civil Authority ratified them or no; I ask *Quo jure*. All obligation to obey any Church-governors as such, must arise from the command of Christ. Now where has he commanded, that in every Nation such a *small part* of the Clergy, as our Convocation consists of, shall be *supreme Governours of all the rest*. When perhaps, they are as

unfit to represent the judgment of all the *Pastors* (not to mention the *people*) in *England*, as the *Council of Trent* all the *Churches in Europe*. I am confident, besides the 2000 silenced Ministers, the far greater part of the *Conforming Clergy* would never have consented to all the late excommunicating Canons, had their Vote been requir'd. And the chief members of the Convocation are so far from being Christ's Officers, that I despair their ever defending the lawfulness, and much more the divine right of their Office against Mr. *Baxter's* Arguments in his foresaid *Treatise of Episcopacy*. Neither the light of nature, nor general laws of Scripture would suggest such an Assembly as the governing Head of the Church of *England*. A duly elected Synod of Pastors in a Nation to endeavour the nearest Unity and Concord of the particular Churches (as far as 'tis to be expected on earth) by their amicable consultations we grant to be most desirable and eligible wherever it may be had; and the judgment of such a Synod should be comply'd with in all things not repugnant to the word of God. But we cannot say so of an Assembly compos'd chiefly of men, whose Office is not only an Usurpation, but such as renders true Church-government impossible, and whose interest and grandure inclines them to keep up the divisions and corruptions which they have made. And to such a Convocation's being entrusted by Christ with the National Church-government, which Mr. *K.* is pleased to assert, I oppose the judgment of the truly learned *Archbishop Usher* which he often profess'd to Mr. *Baxter*, viz. *That Church-Councils are not for Government, but for Unity; Not as being in order of Government over the several Bishops, but that by consultation they may know their duty more clearly, and by agreement maintain Unity, and to that end they were anciently celebrated.*

2. Mr. *K.* takes it for granted also, *That either the Convocation did justly according to the laws of Christ suspend the Non-conforming Ministers, or that those Ministers were bound however to obey their sentence, whether right or wrong.*

For the first, If he will indeed prove their silencing to have been just, i. e. that the *Non-conforming Ministers* were guilty

of such *male-administration* as forfeited their office, and warranted the Prelates by the laws of Christ to depose them, I will assure him, they will quit their office rather than rebel against Christ, or any just deposing sentence of men. But I have already prov'd the sentence to be unjust: And the silencing such a number of Ministers on such grounds, was a crime of that nature, that I would in charity to Mr. K. warn him to draw the guilt of it no further on his own head, by undertaking to justify or defend it.

For the *Second*, That these Ministers, tho unjustly suspended, were bound to obey the sentence, is to give the suspenders the same absolute Authority c'aim'd by Popish Prelates and Councils; and on the same grounds, all the Protestant Ministers in *France* and other Reformed Churches were bound to cease their Ministry when first suspended by Popish Prelates, and so their *Reformation* was only founded on *Church-Rebellion*. Nay, if this be true, it will be in the power of a Convocation in *England* by imposing such sinful terms of Church-Communion as few of the people dare submit to, and silencing all the Pastors that will not approve of them, to oblige the greatest part of the Nation to live without the publick worship of God (as the Popes did sometimes thus *interdict* a whole Kingdom). And he that can believe this, may next be perswaded, that Christ has put the power of damning men into the hands of a Convocation, and the people must not endeavour their own salvation against the will of such a Convocation, tho even the *Apostles* themselves had no power but for *Edification*:

4 Quest. *Whether an Act of Parliament be not as good in France, Spain, or Germany for the Popish Religion, as in England for Protestantcy?*

Ans. Mr. K. justly saith, that 'tis not sufficient the Power which establishes a Religion be competent, and the methods of settling it regular; but 'tis likewise necessary the Religion itself be true, p. 33. No humane laws can justly establish a false

Religion, because God has given no man power to contradict his Revelation and Laws. And tho' subjection be due to the Magistrate, yet his Authority cannot oblige us to *formal* obedience, when he commands us to profess Error, or practice false Worship, or forbids us to *confess with the mouth what we believe with the heart to salvation.*

The only Quest. here is, Whether the Popish or the Protestant Religion be the more agreeable to the holy Scriptures the only infallible Test of all revealed Religion? Which Quest. D: *Manby* shou'd have attempted to resolve by coming to the merits of the Cause, and entering into a particular discussion of the Controversies betwixt the Church of *Rome* and those that have embrac'd the Reformation. Had he done this, he might have spar'd all these impertinent Questions about *Mission*, which are but as Mr. *K.* calls them, meer *Banter*, and contriv'd only to divert people from a necessary enquiry into the principles of the Popish Religion.

Only there is one passage that occasionally drops from Mr. *K.*'s Pen in answer to this last Quest. which I would take notice of, p. 33. *'Tis one principle of the Christian Religion, that the Professors thereof ought to associate into a body, and that Christ the Author thereof has appointed Governors who are to descend by succession, and that to these regularly appointed, due obedience is to be paid, as men value the rewards and punishments of another life.*

'Tis strange to me that Mr. *K.* should think any man able to know what he meant by these words.

If he means, that all the Christians throughout the world must associate in a General Council to set up some universal Officers that shall govern the Church-Catholick as as one *political* society subject to them, or that the Church-Catholick must become one body by a subjection to any humane Head, Pope, Council, or Colledge of Prelates, this is plainly to set up a *Vice-Christ*, and to make a humane center of Unity to the *Catholick Church*, which he seems honestly to disclaim, p. 55. If he mean not thus, why does he talk of Governors appointed to this Catholick body. So for these Governors descending by
success

succession, if he mean that none are lawful Governors but such as can plead an *uninterrupted succession of Prelatical Ordination*, as Mr. *Dodwell* seems to dream), it will hence follow, that 'tis a meer uncertainty whether there be any lawful Governors in the Church at all; and if such Prelates were not known in the primitive Church, either they or the succeeding Ages had no lawful Governors. So when he makes obedience due to these Governors, as men value the rewards or punishments of another life; I hope he means obedience to them so far as they deliver those laws of Christ which he enforces with that solemn sanction; and not obedience to every unnecessary or sinful injunction of their own. And I hope he will not think that Christ has appointed such our Governors, whose very office he never instituted.

And if the meaning of this fine Principle be no more than this, that all Christians must unite in Christ as their Head, and all endeavour to live under such Pastors as he has instituted, and the Pastors endeavour all necessary Concord by their mutual consultations, and be careful to provide such as shall succeed them in the same office; and that to disobey such Pastors when they urge the necessary Doctrines and Laws of *Christ*, is to forfeit the rewards, and incur the punishments of another life; then indeed I see no danger in this Principle. But without all this allowance and explication, it has a very dangerous sound, and Mr. *K.* was not aware what use D. *Manby* might make of it.

For the 2^d and 3^d Points of Mr. *M's* Paper about *Auricular Confession*, and the *Catholick Church*, Mr. *K's* Answer is so judicious and clear, (bating a passage or two that relate to his schismatical Notion of the *Catholick Church*) that I shall not needlessly undertake what he has so well perform'd. The same I may say concerning his Answer to that wild discourse of the Dean's in vindication of the Church of *Rome*, and accusation of the Reformed, except what Mr. *K.* has, p. 79, 80, 81, 82. which runs on the mistakes I have already animadverted on. And 'tis strange Mr. *K.* should, p. 82. quote; *Phil. 3. 15.* to that purpose he there does, which may be applied to the quite
contra-

contrary with far greater advantage, as the Answerers of Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Sermon have at large evinc'd. The *Rule* the Apostle there speaks of, is, what God has prescrib'd to his Church, not the *unnecessary*, and much less the *sinful Canons* of men. And for those that are *otherwise minded*, he leaves them to God's instruction, and does not immediately go about to open their eyes by an *excommunication ipso facto*, much less by a *Writ de Excom. capiendo*. And if other Church-governors had used the same forbearance, there had been fewer *Schisms* and *Divisions* in the Christian world.

For Mr. K's Answer to the *Latin Questions*, there occurs nothing in them disagreeable to the common Protestant Doctrine, which does not refer to the forementioned mistakes.

Having (Honoured Sir) offered you my sense of these passages in Mr. K's Answer, wherein I thought his immoderate affection to a Party perverted his judgment; I shall now put an end to this long Letter, by a few reflections on these matters.

1. I cou'd heartily wish Mr. K. and all that approve these passages in his Book, to consider seriously, Whether they are acted by true Christian charity and love, whilst they deny so many Christian Churches in these Kingdoms living under the Pastoral care of *Orthodox* and *pious Ministers* never *justly* silenc'd, to be any part of the Catholick Church; and that upon such Principles as pass the same hard censure on all the Reformed Churches that were set up as separate from Popish National Churches? To *unchurch* true Churches, is the most opposite to that love which is the life of Christian Unity, and is the highest degree of *Schism*. How much more to unchurch so many, and those so eminent for the purity of Faith, Worship, and Practice; nay, for their charity too towards those parts of the Catholick Church that are less pure than themselves. I should heartily rejoyce if any one could shew me any Churches on this earth wherein there is a more pure, peaceable and credible profession of *Christianity* made (as to its integrals as well as essentials) than in those *Reformed Churches abroad*, and those at *home*, which I have here been obliged to defend

defend from the Assau't of a Protestant Divine. I am farr from denying our Parish Churches to be true parts of the *Catholick* Church, and I hope all that account themselves oblig'd on the reasons suggested in this Paper to frequent other Christian Societies do esteem them as such, and own all the credible profession of Religion made among them. Tho there are many things wherein they cou'd desire them reform'd, especially they cou'd wish them that liberty of consenting to their own Pastors which was the general practice of the *Catholick* Church in its purest Ages, and was confirm'd by the judgment of so many Councils ; See Mr. *Baxters* Church History passim, and his Answ. to Dr. *Stillingfl.* p. 128, 129, &c. and *Blondel, de jure plebis, &c.* And they would be glad to see some tolerable exercise of that true and godly discipline which the *Common=prayer book* acknowledges was practic'd in the *primitive Church*, and the restoration whereof, it saith, *is much to be wished.* But the mischief is, tho they have a protest assent and consent to this, 'tis only to wish it, for they have sworn to endeavour no alteration how desirable soever.

2 I wou'd hope that long experience will convince us all of the necessity of more large and comprehensive terms of Christian Concord, as farr as that is to be expected or attain'd on earth. I hope the Churches unity, will no more be lay'd by *Protestants* on such humane Canons as are not only unnecessary but contrary to the Churches interest and edification. Nor the breach of such a sinful unity, be branded as *Schism* and *Church=Rebellion*, Mr. *Hales* of *Eaton* and Dr. *Stillingfleet* (once) were of another mind, and lay'd the charge of *Schism*, in all such cases at the right Door, viz. the Imposers.

3. Tho I can expect no perfect cure of our divisions (unless the Churches in these Nations were cemented on a more wide and *Catholick* foundation, I mean not the schismatical terms of the *Roman Church*) Yet I wou'd humbly propose it to the Consideration, both of the sober charitable *Conformists* and *Nonconformists*, whether something may not be done to promote some considerable degrees of *Concord* even while the differences of our judgment and practice do remain.

May they not publickly declare, they own each others Assemblies, for true Christian Churches? May not their members to testifie a true Catholick charity maintain occasional Communion? shou'd it not be own'd scismatical on either hand to confine that part of Christ's Catholick Church which is in these Kingdoms to either party? May not the Pastors own each other for true Ministers of the Gospel, and Pastors to such as consent to their Pastoral relation? (I speak of such as want not the necessary qualifications) May they not rejoyce in the success of each others labours for promoting that common Interest of Christianity wherein both are agreed? For sure that ought to be infinitely dearer to us then the narrow Interest of a party, or the Interest of more dubious Opinions and modes of Worship. May they not concur to promote each others just esteem and reputation in order to the success of their labours? May they not maintain a more amicable correspondence in order to a nearer union of their affections and if possible of their judgment and practice too? May they not forbear unjust Calumnies and reviling language to render each other odious? May they not love and honour in each other whatever there appears of the Image of their Lord and Master his gifts and graces? May they not both joyn in the defence of the Reformed Religion upon the common principles wherein the Protestant Churches agreed? And would not so much of mutual affection and concord tend more to credit true Religion and strengthen its real Interest, then the contrary uncharitable narrow and irreconcilable Temper? I doubt not but the truly moderate on both sides are acted by this truly Catholick and Christian Temper; And it wou'd be a comfortable presage to these Churches to see this temper more generally diffus'd and prevalent among us. But for those that will still fancy Christ has every where committed the government of his church to *Diocesan* Prelates and by catholick *Unity* mean a *subjection* to all their canons and censures, and make all disobedience to *their* commands when contrary to the commands of *Christ*, *Schism* and *Church Rebellion*, They may long talk of Catholick Unity and Peace, But they are next to the *Papists* the most dangerous enemies of it; For they have too deep

deep a tincture of their humour who make a mighty noise about *Unity* but when we come to enquire where it lies, They mean a subjection to a certain *Gentleman* that dwells at *Rome*, or at best to that *Clergy* who adhere to him in all the corruptions of Christian Doctrine worship and Practice.

Lastly, I wou'd advise all of Mr. K's mind to consider well the *Catholick* principles suggested in this paper (in opposition to his *schismatical ones*) to the case of a *popish convocation* in *Eng. or Irel.* shou'd such a convocation suspend him from *preaching his protestant doctrine* & *administring prot sacraments* (as *D. M. cal's* them) and he go on to do it, By his own Notions he wou'd be a *schismatick and Church-Rebel*, by mine a faithful pastor to his Flock and a *Loyal* subject of Jesus Christ. And therefore whether his principles or mine be more *honest*, more agreeable to the holy Scriptures more serviceable to advance the Authority and Interest of Christ, more conducive to the welfare of Souls, I leave to his own conscience to determine on second thoughts; And doubt not but most of his own Brethren will acknowledge mine to be so.

I cannot but reflect on these debates with deep regret that I am put on so unhappy necessity, not only of opposing Mr. K. but saying so much against the present *Church-Government* in order to the Vindication of the *Reformed Churches* both at home and abroad, and the *Truth* it self. But as these principles I have here reflected on have been the fatal *Engines* of *Church Tyranny* and *divisions* these many *Ages*, and belong to the *Roman Arsenall*, so tis the necessary work of a *Peacemaker* who proposes a *Catholick Unity* and Love as his great aim to batter them down. I had not so long delay'd the sending this paper, but that I still hoped some abler pen would have undertaken what mine is so unfit for, However I hope I have asserted nothing contrary either to *Truth* or *Peace*, or if I have, I am willing to receive better Information.

I am

Sir.

Your most humble *Yrs.*

K

Post.

A POSTSCRIPT.

THe person to whom the Letter was address'd desiring me to publish it, I thought it requisite upon a review of it, to add a few things relating to some passages in it. The opposition of Mr. K's Notion of the *Catholick Church* to the Articles of the *Church of Ireland*, and the agreeableness of mine to them is observ'd in the Preface.

To what is said about Mr. K's mark of the *Catholick Church*, viz. [*living under lawful spiritual Governors*;] I add, that this renders the relation of all true Christians to our blessed Lord (as his members) as questionable as the title of the Pastor under whom they live; and consequently exposes their right to all the benefits of the Gospel, even to the Kingdom of Heaven it self to the same uncertainties and doubts as the regularity of his Admission to his Office. And if those ancient *Canons* repeated in so many *Councils* be of any force, which declare all Elections of the *Clergy* by *Magistrates*, or *without the consent of the people*, void; what a desperate case has almost all the *Christian world* been in ever since the old way of Elections was alter'd! Nay, the *Church of England* it self, where the *Bishops* are chosen by the *King*, and *Parsons* by *Patrons*, is in a miserable plight. So severe is this mark of the *Catholick Church* on those for whose secular interest Mr. K. seems to have calculated it, and so over-favourable to those whom he design'd to exclude from the *Catholick Church* by it.

For what is said on behalf of all the *Reformed Churches*, p. 11, &c. It is not intended to include the *Socinians*, who deny an essential Article of the *Christian Faith*, the *Deity of Christ*, and all the *Doctrines* of his *Satisfaction*, &c. that depend on it.

Against Mr. K's Notion of the Supreme Government over all the Christians in *England* being lodg'd in the *Convocation* touch'd on, p. 57th. I add this Argument *ad hominem*; The *General Assembly* in *Scotland* have equal pretensions to the Supreme Government of all Christians in that Nation, as the *Con-*

vocation has in *England*. Now if the laws of the *Convocation* would oblige the Consciences of all the Christians in *England* (as the laws of the Church) whether ratified by the Civil Authority or no, then the Acts of the General Assembly in *Scotland* have the same force there; Now that General Assembly which sat there in the year 1639. (whose Acts were also ratified afterwards by King *Ch.* the First in person, present in his Parliament there) abolished Prelacy, and set up the Presbyterian Government there. The Prelates were, according to Mr. *K's* Principles, discharg'd from their Office, and since they regain'd it not only without the allowance of any General Assembly, but against the Acts or Laws of all that sat there since, they were therein guilty of *Schism* or *Church Rebellion*. Mr. *K's* Notions are as unmerciful to the *Bishops* there as to *Presbyters* here: So little does he regard where those envenom'd darts may fall, which he levels against his Dissenting Brethren.

The Contents of the Letter

MR. *M's* 1 *Quest.* in the Preface, What is meant by the Catholick Church. Mr. *K's* Answer consider'd, and evident'd to be obscure, narrow, and consequently schismatical and dangerous, from p. 2 to p. 7.

The true Answer to that Question. p. 7, 8, 9, 10.

Mr. *M's* 2d and 3d Questions. Mr. *K's* Answer enlarg'd, to make it more Catholick and comprehensive. p. 10, 11.

Mr. *M's* 4th *Quest.* Whether by the Catholick Church be meant the variety of all Protestants since they deny her essential mark; Unity? The true Catholick Answer propos'd, p. 11, 12, 13.

Mr. *K's* Answer to that Question consider'd; His three marks of the Catholick members of the Church examin'd. His first [Embracing the Catholick Faith] allow'd. His second [Living in Charity with their neighbour Churches] excludes the Papists, Mr. *Dodwel*, and himself, and a great part of the Christian world in the present and former Ages. His third mark [Making no separation from their lawful Governors] founded on his schismatical Notion of the Catholick Church. Two Questions propos'd on that Head.

1. Whether the separation of the Presbyterians, &c. (supposing it to be sinful) will exclude them from being Catholick members of the Church? That it does not, prov'd from the nature of their separation, being only a breach of humane Unity: The contrary Assertion excludes the English Convocation,

the Papists, and the greatest part of the Christian Church in every Age from being Catholick members, &c. from p. 16. to p. 20.

2: Upon what grounds does Mr. K. assert that the Presbyterians have made a sinful separation from their lawful Governors? Some difficulties propos'd on that Head; That the Presbyt. Ministers are lawful Pastors to the Churches under their oversight, prov'd, from p. 21, to p. 30:

The Q's in the Pamphlet about Mission. The true Notion of Mission stated: The Authority and Obligation of Pastors to the duties of their Office, derived from Christ's Charter: The use of Pastoral Ordination: Its absolute necessity to the being of the Ministry disprov'd: The power of Ordination belongs to scriptural Bishops: Such Bishops prov'd to be the Pastors of single Congregations, not Diocesses, from Scripture and Antiquity: The Ordination of Presbyt. Ministers at home and abroad, hence vindicated, from p. 38. to p. 48: These premis'd.

Mr. M's 1st Q. What Priesthood or holy Orders had the first Reformers but what they received from Rom. Cath. Bishops? Answered. p. 48, 49

His 2^d Q. Who authorized the first Reformers to Preach their Protestant Doctrine, and administer their Protestant Sacraments? Answered, and retorted on the Church of Rome. p. 49:

His 3^d and 4th Q's; Whether Cranmer and his Associates could condemn the Church of Rome by virtue of the Mission derived from her Bishops; If so, whether a Presbyt. Minister having received Orders from a Protestant Bishop, can by virtue of such Order pronounce the Church of England a corrupt Church? Answered. p. 50, 51:

Mr. K's Answer examined: His Concession to D. M. [That a Bishop or Presbyter ought not to preach against the Constitution of the Church he is a member of; and if he be censured or suspended, he is discharg'd, &c.] consider'd; The consequences of it pernicious to a great part of the Reformed Churches, and to our own, had we a Popish Convocation. The grounds of it absurd and false. The silence'd NG. Ministers not chargeable with Schism or Church-Rebellion; the charge more likely to fall heavy on the unjust silencers, unless Mr. K. can prove both the divine right of the Convocation to be the Ecclesiastical Head of the Church of England, and the equity of their silencing sentence, from p. 51 to p. 59:

5th Q. Whether an Act of Parl. &c. Answered, p. 59, 60:

Some general Remarks on the rest of Mr. K's Answer, p. 60, 61, 62:

Reflections on the whole, from p. 62 to the end:

A Postscript:

FINIS:

ERRATA.

PAGE 7: l: 21: r: Arimini: (To line 24. add (And not the Catholick Church, as visible, or as measur'd by a Judgment of Charity, as the Papists assert, and Mr. K. with them, contrary to the stream of protestant writers on that Controversie) p: 9: l: 15: after commandment, add an &c: p: 23: l: 30: r: 7th v: p: 40: l: ult: r: prelacy. p: 59: l: 28: r: 5th Q: p: 63: l: 17: blot out 2